goods and titles. Men who have been honored and praised as successful men, big men, even called great men. But the successful man is the one who deals in true human values, the Golden Rule, the lasting benefits.

The world little notes nor remembers what what we leave behind in material goods. But as we pass this way on earth, if we could help someone in his time of trouble, we will have achieved some small measure of immortality.

The rest of us were not given that great mind that George Carver had; but each of us has a heart, if we'll use it. We can all have the compassion for our fellow man that George Carver had.

George Washington Carver was a great man in the true sense of greatness. It is only right that we should do him honor on these days. And, as the years go by, I hope that this shrine will grow not only in its physical appearance, but in the number of people who will come here and learn about this man who walked with God every day of his life and fulfilled God's purpose nobly.

National Interstate Highway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following exchange of correspondence I had with John C. Mackie, Michigan State highway commissioner, concerning the financing plan for the construction of the National Interstate Highway System reported out of the Ways and Means Committee last week.

LANSING, MICH., *July 30, 1959.*

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Michigan will be forced to scrap its 5-year, $1¼ billion new highway program if Congress passes slow-down financing plan for construction of the National Interstate Highway System reported out of House Ways and Means Committee yesterday. The Department is stunned and dejected at the committee's action. The bill will reduce Federal highway aid to Michigan in 1960–61–62 $141 million under levels anticipated when our program was announced. (From $278.6 million to $136.8 million.) Frankly, it almost amounts to a break in faith by the Congress with the various highway departments from amounts planned when the 1956 Federal highway bill was passed and the Federal gas tax increased from 1½ to 3 cents. We have been desperately gearing our engineering right-of-way and design schedules pointing toward a record 1960 construction year which would put Michigan far out front in highways. It seems incredible long hours of urgent labor we have put into gearing for 1960 may have been spent in vain. Michigan has already programed $84 million in 1960 Interstate Federal aid with the Bureau of Public Roads, but the committee bill will allow us only $58.6 million instead of the $96.7 million we had been promised. The action amounts to penalizing States that have moved with speed to build roads. Grim reality of what proposed cutback means probably best illustrated by projects which will be slowed or indefinitely delayed, scheduled for 1960 and 1961. They include the following:

1. Walter P. Chrysler Expressway, Metropolitan Detroit, plus right-of-way and engineering on 12 miles of the proposed Fisher Expressway in Detroit, Wayne County.

2. One hundred and fifteen miles Detroit-Muskegon Expressway, U.S. 16 (Interstate 96) in Livingston, Ingham, Clinton, Kent, Ottawa, Muskegon Counties.

3. Forty-seven miles relocation U.S. 25 (Interstate 94) which calls for extension of the Edsel Ford Expressway through Macomb and St. Clair Counties to Port Huron.

4. Seventy-two miles of relocation of U.S. 27 and U.S. 2 (Interstate 75) in Crawford, Otsego, and Chippewa Counties.

5. Forty-four miles of relocated U.S. 10 (Interstate 75) in Oakland County from South Oakland County to connection with the Fenton-Clio Expressway in Genesee County. We will have to abandon our announced schedule for these and a few other projects unless Congress restores interstate aid to levels anticipated when the interstate program was originally established.

JOHN C. MACKIE,
State Highway Commissioner.

JULY 31, 1959.

Mr. JOHN C. MACKIE,
State Highway Commissioner,
Lansing, Mich.:

I have received your telegram of July 30 deploring action of House Ways and Means Committee in reporting slow-down financing plan for construction of the National Interstate Highway System. I agree that this would have serious effect on the several Michigan projects mentioned in your telegram and would regret any delay or slowing up of interstate program in our State. Since Ways and Means Committee, however, has rejected all other proposals for additional financing, I do not know what alternative remains at this late date in our session. It is too bad that members of your Democratic Party who control this committee as well as House of Representatives did not support alternative financing plan which would have permitted the program to proceed according to schedule. Now that we are apparently faced with this financing proposal or nothing, I am afraid we will have to support whatever the Ways and Means Committee brings before us.

Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 4, 1959

Dr. Caradine R. Hooton, general secretary, General Board of Temperance, the Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Heavenly Father, who by Thy beloved Son hast taught us that Thou art love, strengthen the witness of all those who, following His example, give themselves to the service of their fellow men. Grant unto these and all other leaders of our Nation the clear vision to perceive the things which retard our progress toward Christian maturity; give us the high purpose, the unfailing courage, and the unwavering perseverance so to discipline our lives and direct our actions that law, order, justice, and peace may here and everywhere prevail, to the glory of Thy holy name and the good of Thy whole family, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 3, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—CONFERENCE REPORTS ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in connection with the mutual security appropriation bill, I notice that the Appropriations Committee has scheduled hearings on this very important piece of proposed legislation; and I know the hearings will be thorough and exhaustive, as always.

I wish to congratulate the distinguished occupant of the chair, the President pro tempore, for the very fine record the Senate Appropriations Committee has made under his leadership and under his guidance thus far this session. Fourteen appropriation bills, as I recall, have been passed by the Senate thus far. The military construction appropriation bill and the mutual security appropriation bill are yet to be reported to the Senate by the Appropriations Committee.

Many Senators—dozens, I would say—have talked to me about the possibility of having final action taken on the appropriations bills which have passed the

Senate and have gone to conference. I do not attribute blame to any Member of Congress on either side of the aisle or in either body; but as regards the mutual security appropriation bill, I hope that before the Appropriations Committee sets a rigid schedule of hearings, mornings and afternoons, which will interfere with the conferences on the other appropriation bills, the members of both the House committee and the Senate committee will give due consideration to acting on the appropriation bills which already are in conference.

For instance, Mr. President, it was July 9 when one of the most important of the appropriation bills passed the Senate, and a conference was requested. I am informed that the House has agreed to the conference; but no conference has yet been held on the civil functions appropriation bill.

I certainly hope that the Defense Department appropriation bill conference report will be acted on by the House of Representatives today, and that action on that conference report will be completed in the Senate today. That bill involves approximately $40 billion. The bill, as passed, is approximately in the amount of the President's budget estimates; I believe the total amount is within a few million dollars, one way or the other, of the amounts the President recommended.

However, the supplemental appropriation bill, which passed the Senate only yesterday, and the atomic energy appropriation bill, the independent offices appropriation bill, the legislative appropriation bill, and—most important—the civil functions appropriation bill have not yet cleared the conference committees.

So I am not going to ask the Senate to act on any other appropriation bill until we clean up some of the appropriation bills in conference. I bespeak the cooperation of Senators on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state that agreement has been reached to go to conference tomorrow afternoon on the atomic energy appropriation bill and on Thursday on the public works appropriation bill. Those agreements were reached this morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I congratulate the Chair for his expeditious action. Again he has demonstrated why he is one of the most efficient and one of the most beloved Members of the Senate. If, in order to hold the necessary conferences, he finds it necessary to have the Senate adjourn, the Senate will be glad to take time off on Thursday, Friday, or Saturday.

But I believe it important that we get the rest of these appropriation bills to the President.

I think it very evident that these appropriation bills, as passed by the two Houses, will be hundreds of millions of dollars below the President's budget estimates; and I believe it important that the fake, phony, hypocritical charge that the congressional Democrats are the spenders is now exposed in such a way that even a prejudiced press will have to report it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield first to the minority leader, and then I shall yield to my friend on this side of the aisle.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, I should like to make two observations:

Mr. President, if I have not said this before, I certainly do bestow a compliment on the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], particularly with special reference to the complete fairness with which he has conducted the hearings on the mutual security appropriation bills in past years. I think I tried to be completely diligent in being on hand at all times when those hearings were in progress. Everyone knows that the mutual security appropriation bill is a highly knotty and controversial measure. Yet the chairman of the committee has been eminently fair at all times; and everyone who had something to say about the bill, either for or against any of its items, was given abundant opportunity to make his presentation.

So I am confident that the hearings on that measure this year will be conducted in precisely the same fashion.

Now I must make one observation with respect to what the majority leader just now stated about winding up with the appropriation bills, as passed by the two Houses, in total amounts hundreds of millions of dollars below the President's budget estimates. Let me say that nothing could delight me more; and I bestow a compliment where the compliment is deserved, and I give the compliment right now to the majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas; but when I do so——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois be willing to stop just before he reaches the "but", and insert a period, and then begin with a new paragraph? [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes; because I will remember what I was going to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let the Senator from Illinois proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was going to point out, Mr. President, that we should not forget that early in this session the distressed areas bill, as passed, called for $87 million; and let us also not forget that the Federal-aid airport bill, as passed, called for hundreds of millions of dollars in excess of the estimates.

So I think we should take credit for pursuing with proper diligence, decent grace——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Whom does the Senator from Illinois mean when he uses the word "we"?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The minority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the compliment is due the entire Congress.

First, as regards the appropriation bills, let me say that every Senator who has been here as long as the Senator from Illinois has knows that an authorization bill is not an appropriation bill, and that billions of dollars of authorizations are never appropriated for. Frequently, authorization bills are used to hoodwink and to mislead people.

However, nothing provided in any authorization bill would prevent the Senate from keeping the amounts of the appropriation bills passed this year below the amounts of the budget estimates. Nothing contained in the Federal-aid-to-airports authorization bill, which the Congress voted for almost unanimously, would prevent the amount of the appropriation bill from being less than the amount of the budget estimates, this year.

The Senator from Texas is willing to assume as much responsibility for having the amounts of the appropriation bills, as passed, below the amounts of the budget estimates as is the minority leader. But the Senator from Texas wants the Congress and its record to be presented to the people. And the record is that this year the Congress has not used to any extent any back-door financing that has not been requested by the President or approved by the President. And the record is that this so-called spending Congress is going to spend hundreds of millions of dollars less than the President asked for.

And that record both parties are entitled to share in. But this phony Madison Avenue slick propaganda that goes out, that refers to congressional spenders, ought to be exposed for the fraud it is. So far as the Senator from Texas is concerned, he is going to call the roll from now "until"—and to point out that on 16 recommendations the President made in the appropriation bills this year it has been necessary to cut 14 of those bills. The net reduction will result in hundreds of millions of dollars less being available to be spent than the President requested. That has been true in every year of the Eisenhower administration. It has been necessary for Congress to reduce the budget requests by more than $10 billion, and $10 billion is not hay.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader permit a comment on what he has just said?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First of all, I thought I had taken care of responding to this back door business on a number of occasions. Secondly, I would observe that nothing can delight the human heart more than when religion comes, even in the fiscal field; and, of course, we have told our story with diligence to the country, and I am glad it has brought such fruitful results. I compliment the majority leader. I am delighted that, under his able, spirited, and skillful leadership this fine result can be achieved, and that all of us, on both sides of the aisle, can glory in the fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want to point out this is not the result of any persuasiveness on the part of the distinguished minority leader. These results were obtained before the distinguished and beloved Senator from Illinois became minority leader.

In 1957, the President invited Congress to cut his budget, and we did, to the tune of five big, fat billion dollars. [Laughter.] The distinguished Secretary of the Treasury at that time stated we were going to have a hair-curling depression if we did not cut the budget. So we cut it by $5 billion, and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the almost monthly statements made by the majority leader at that time, calling attention to the necessity of being practical and prudent, and calling attention to the fact that Congress should exercise its responsibility and cut each appropriation bill. That was in 1957.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENTS, 1957 BUDGET, BY SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON

March 8, 1957: After indicating that a survey made in Texas favored a reduction in the budget, Senator JOHNSON said his efforts would be directed toward that end.

April 8, 1957: In a floor discussion, Senator JOHNSON pointed out that the highest peacetime budget under President Roosevelt was $9 billion; under President Truman $39.6 billion (compared to the estimated budget for 1958 of $71.8 billion).

May 1, 1957: Senator JOHNSON pointed out the inconsistency in statements made by members of the executive branch; some responsible Cabinet officers recommending that the budget be cut, but when cuts were made in the House, asking the Senate to restore them. He further said that he was going to vote his convictions and not vote for any grant that could not be fully justified.

May 2, 1957: Again commenting on the inconsistency of statements made, Senator JOHNSON pointed out that the President had appealed to the people to support his budget while some Cabinet officers were saying if the budget wasn't cut there would be a hair curling depression.

May 8, 1957: In commenting on the budget, Senator JOHNSON said, "We cannot cut the budget without cutting spending, and we cannot adopt one course in January and another course in May."

May 13, 1957: Senator JOHNSON commented on the coming speech of the President before the Nation in defense of his budget. He pointed out that the administration wanted to eat its cake and have it too. While the President was pleading for his budget, others in the administration were demanding substantial cuts to bolster the administration's economy record. Senator JOHNSON also pointed out that those advocating cuts in some instances wanted to take the cuts from veterans, the farmers, slum dwellers, and students and then raise postal rates, in other words, increase one of the taxes on our people.

June 3, 1957: Senator JOHNSON commented on congressional handling of appropriation bills and pointed out that thus far this year the Senate has had an excellent record. Our committee (Appropriations) has gone over the bills carefully and thoroughly. The result, I believe has been the type of economy which the American taxpayers are demanding. No budget is sacrosanct. It is simply the judgment of the President and his Budget Bureau as to the amount of money the administration thinks it needs to operate over a period of time.

July 11, 1957: Senator JOHNSON, in discussing the battle of the budget, provided figures which indicate reductions approaching $4 billion—or 6.4 percent—from the President's budget that was submitted to us in January. Up to this point, appropriation requests totaling $60,553,833,463, have gone through some stage of consideration by this Congress. On the basis of their current status, they have been cut to $56,656,136,959."

August 9, 1957: Senator JOHNSON said: "All of us, I believe, recall the statement by the Secretary of Treasury concerning the budget. The then Secretary, said it would have to be cut to avoid a hair-curling depression. I have before me figures which show that when all the bills are taken into account, this Congress has reduced the President's budget by $5,927,495,584 or 9.1 percent."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in 1958 we did the same thing.

The majority leader met with the President on November 18, 1958, at the White House. The President told the majority leader at that time of his plans for his budget and the necessity of holding down expenditures, and solicited an expression from the majority leader. The majority leader reminded the President then that each year the President had been in office the Congress had cut his request for expenditure, and I refer to the President's appropriation request. So far as the majority leader is aware, this back-door financing thing is just a smokescreen, because the principal advocate of back-door financing has been the administration itself. The administration has asked for the only back door financing the Congress has consented to. So we ought to nail that camouflage.

The majority leader said to the President on November 18 that Congress cut every budget the President ever submitted and I predicted we would cut this one, and we have, and we are going to cut further.

We have raised the amounts provided in some bills above the budget requests. I think we shall increase probably 2 out of the 16 appropriation bills. We will reduce 14 out of the 16. But we will have a net decrease under the budget this year, as we have had each year under the Eisenhower administration, to the tune of several hundred million dollars.

Mr. President, I know it costs more for the Government to operate these days. I remember when I heard the able minority leader make speeches in the other body on economy, when the highest peacetime budget that Mr. Franklin Roosevelt ever had as President was $9 billion. I remember hearing one distinguished statesman say this country can never stand more than a $10 billion budget. The highest peacetime budget Mr. Franklin Roosevelt ever had was $9 billion. Then Mr. Truman became President. The highest peacetime budget under Mr. Truman was $39 billion. Now we have $70 billion budgets, and Congress comes along and whittles away on each appropriation bill.

I spent hours, days, and weeks trying to get $33 million out of the State, Justice, and courts appropriation bill. We have done that to 14 bills. Here we come up with savings of several hundred million dollars, but they say, "Oh, that is not the whole story. What about authorizations?" I say we have billions of dollars of authorizations that we never appropriate for. In the last analysis, authorizations are controlled by appropriations. Anybody who has been here long enough to know the difference between authorizations and appropriations knows that to be true, although efforts can be made to befuddle the people. They say, "What about backdoor financing?" They try to give you that Madison Avenue, slick propaganda stuff. Our answer is, "Who is asking for backdoor financing?" The administration has asked for $4 billion for the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. That is all the backdoor financing that has been approved this year. But they try to make Tom Jones on the farm think we are doing something else.

Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that each Congress under the Eisenhower administration, including the Republican 83d Congress, has found it necessary to reduce materially each budget.

I want to be fair, and I state that Congress traditionally cuts the Executive budget. It traditionally reduced Mr. Truman's budget. It traditionally reduced Mr. Roosevelt's budget. It even had to reduce Mr. Hoover's budget. So this is not anything new. But when I pick up the newspapers and magazines and listen to the radio and hear the regular stage set and the talks about congressional spenders, I ask who they are talking about. I am surprised anybody in the Congress would want to foul his own nest in the record, but the record is here for anyone to read:

One hundred and ten million dollars below the budget on Agriculture. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is the chairman of that subcommittee.

Nineteen million dollars below the budget for Commerce. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is the chairman of that subcommittee.

Nineteen million, nine hundred and sixty-one thousand dollars under the budget for defense.

Interior, $9 million under the budget.

Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare, $259 million over the budget. We thought it desirable to spend more than requested for the health and education of our people.

State and Justice, $33 million below the budget.

Treasury-Post Office, $44 million under the budget.

Independent offices, $76 million under the budget.

Legislative, $4 million under the budget.

Supplemental, $44 million under the budget.

Atomic Energy, $50 million under the budget.

We suppose the appropriation for the mutual security authorization bill is going to be under the budget, because we authorized hundreds of millions less than the President asked for.

When the whole story is written, the record of this session of Congress is going to be the same as the record of any other Congress under this administration. We have had to cut the President's budget requests.

Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Montana and to the Senator from Illinois during this morning hour period.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to point out that I was interested in what the distinguished minority leader had to say about someone seeing the light of fiscal responsibility. I am sure the Senator was talking about the President of the United States and the administration. I happened to see and to enjoy the appearance of the minority leader on a nationwide TV program a week ago Sunday. A question came up—was raised by one of the participants: Did the Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, think that the Democrats in Congress this year were going to again reduce the President's budget requests? The distinguished minority leader replied that not only the Democrats, but also the Republicans as well, would do so.

I think the Senator hit the nail on the head, because, as the majority leader has pointed out, in every session under the administration of Mr. Eisenhower—and, in the two sessions of the 83d Congress, under Republican control—under both the Democrats and Republicans, the budget estimates submitted by the administration have been cut; and I think they have been cut on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am certain that will be done again this year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Surely.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for that reason I entered into an agreement with the distinguished former minority leader, Mr. Knowland, so that we could make sure anybody who wanted to increase the budget estimates could vote against the bill, anybody who wanted to reduce the budget estimates could vote against the bill and anybody who wanted to approve the bill could vote for it. We began a policy of calling the roll on all appropriation bills.

I make no partisan claim in this matter. I am not speaking only for the Democrats. I want to put into the RECORD the votes which have been taken on the appropriation bills thus far.

The vote on the second supplemental appropriation bill was 80 to 1.

The vote on the Agriculture Department appropriation bill was 74 to 10.

The vote on the Commerce Department appropriation bill was 89 to 4.

The vote on the Defense Department appropriation bill—and I congratulate the very able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]—was 90 to 0.

The vote on the District of Columbia appropriation bill was 68 to 0.

The vote on the Interior Department appropriation bill was 82 to 0.

The vote on the legislative appropriation bill was 80 to 1.

The vote on the State-Justice Departments appropriation bill was 90 to 0.

The vote on the Treasury, Post Office appropriation bill was 53 to 3.

The vote on the independent offices appropriation bill was 89 to 1.

The vote on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill was 84 to 10.

The vote on the General Government matters appropriation bill was 79 to 2.

The vote on the public works appropriation bill was 82 to 7.

Those were the votes when those bills passed this body.

I wish to point out there were not more than a dozen votes against any appropriation bill. Of course, of the dozen, some Senators may have thought not enough money was being spent, and that we ought to spend more. Some Senators no doubt thought we ought to spend less. In any event, the Senate approved of the action. By and large, seven out of eight votes which have been cast in this body have been cast for the appropriation bills.

The Congress as an institution has maintained the very fine record which it has set throughout the years of being careful, of being frugal, of being prudent, and at the same time meeting the needs of our people. Where it was necessary to increase expenditures for the conservation of our resources, as in regard to the Civil Functions appropriation bill, we have done so. Where it was necessary to increase the President's budget estimates $259 million for the health of our people, we have done so. But in the regular bureaucratic setup which we find prevailing in Washington, we have gone into the dark corners and we have cut hundreds of millions of dollars out of those expenditures.

I predict that when the final bill is completed we will have provided several hundred million dollars under the budget estimates this year, as we have done each year during this administration. And the grand total will be in excess of $10 billion.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, nothing so fortifies and sharpens my personal pride as a record of accomplishment by that great institution of government of which I have been a Member for more than 25 years. When the Senate joins in and harkens to the leadership, to the wisdom, and to the prudence of the President, when he constantly asserts the necessity for a balanced budget, that makes me happy, too. I am delighted to see that great cooperative venture between the legislative branch and the Executive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I want to question the point that the Congress cannot act except on the wisdom of the President. The Congress has some wisdom of its own, whether the Senator wants to admit it or not, and the Congress has demonstrated it each time. Congress has demonstrated it is $10 billion more frugal than the President has been or than the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has been.

I think that the Senator from Illinois joined in expressing that determination to cut some of the "fat" out of these budgets, and we ought to admit it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I continue, Mr. President?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator, but I reserve the right to make comments from time to time. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Frankly, Mr. President, I have never become emotional about an arithmetic problem. I think of what a character of Charles Dickens—whose name was Thomas Gradgrind—said:

> Now, what I want is, facts. * * * Facts alone are wanted in life.

I am delighted that the majority leader is going to include all this statistical data in the RECORD, because then it will be my duty to analyze it and also to point out, probably, some of the things which I might regard as divergences, shall I say, and to set the whole matter in what I consider to be an adequate perspective.

There are such things as vetoes. There are such things as authorizations, where it is intended full well to spend all the money which is authorized if it is appropriated.

I make these comments conscious of the fact that there have been these curtailments in appropriation bills. But I also point out, for instance, when we take credit for that kind of a cut in the Agriculture Department appropriation bill, there is $100 million of reduction which should not have been made if the Commodity Credit Corporation is to pay the bills already ascertained by the Treasury Department more than a year ago. We owe those bills, and we cannot duck them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Did the Senator offer an amendment to do that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether I offered an amendment or whether the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] offered an amendment, but I pointed out, on the floor, the facts. I said it was a spurious cut, because the bill was owing and was due.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority of the Senate, apparently, did not agree with the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois finds himself in the minority quite often. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The vote on that appropriation bill was 74 to 10.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I was 1 of the 10. I was one of those who voted against the $390 million increase in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department appropriation bill. I also voted against the conference report, so that the record might be consistent, in the interest of a balanced budget.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am sure the Senator would be one who would vote for certain increases in the mutual security bill. It is entirely a question of judgment. Some people believe we ought to increase that bill and reduce the bill for the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. Some people think we ought to increase both bills.

But I want to point out that when the entire record is written the Senate figures will be several hundred million dol-

lars under the President's budget estimates. Does the Senator deny that that is true, with regard to the bills which have passed, as shown by the schedule of the bills on the back of the calendar

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, not for one minute. I take great pleasure in it. I again compliment the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. I compliment the entire Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us give credit where credit is due.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I compliment the entire Senate, Mr. President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So that the whole story may be told. I think we owe that to the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have done my best to tell the whole story, but I am not sure we always get the whole story from the other end of the Avenue. I have seen very few statements from there calling attention to the reductions Congress has made.

Oh, when we make a reduction in the mutual security bill, we are told we have to restore it post haste. But with regard to the regular, routine reductions we make in regard to each bill, very little attention is given to the matter. I think it is important for the Record to show, even if it does take some compiling of statistics, that in regard to the 16 requests which the President has made, through his Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Appropriations Committee and the Senate will reduce 14 of those substantially, and the net result will be hundreds of millions of dollars saved for the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One other observation, and then I shall have finished, Mr. President.

I should point out that forbearance and unselfishness are great Christian virtues, and we should not expect a pat on the back for doing our duty as the legislative branch of the Government.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED APPROPRIATION, BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 44)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed appropriation, for the fiscal year 1960, in the amount of $20,000, for the Boston National Historic Sites Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Foundation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REAPPOINTMENT AND RETIREMENT OF ELWOOD R. QUESADA

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to reappoint Elwood R. Quesada, formerly lieutenant general, U.S. Air Force, retired, to the grade of major general and to retire him in the grade of lieutenant general, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REMOVAL OF GEOGRAPHICAL LIMITATIONS ON ACTIVITIES OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to remove geographical limitations on activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FLEXIBILITY IN PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY AND WEATHER BUREAU

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide flexibility in the performance of certain functions of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and of the Weather Bureau (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recall that on July 15 of this year the Senate passed Senate bill 1681, to provide a larger degree of self-government to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Currently, this bill is pending before the District of Columbia Committee in the House of Representatives. Together with this Senate-passed bill, there are now pending before this committee 20-odd bills relating to self-government for the District of Columbia; including H.R. 4637, introduced by Representative REUSS, of Wisconsin, which bill was recommended and is supported by the administration and the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners. I understand that hearings are now being held by the House District of Columbia Committee on all these bills.

Over the years, there have been serious differences of opinion as to what should be the status of residents of the District of Columbia; as well as the relationships of their governing authority to the Federal Government.

We realize, of course, that it is important to provide the District residents with as large a voice in their government as possible; as well as an opportunity to exercise other rights and privileges, such as voting, under the Constitution.

Today I received from Stanley J. Witkowski, city clerk of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., a resolution adopted by the Common Council of Milwaukee supporting self-government for the District of Columbia. I request unanimous consent to have the resolution printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Whereas although local self-government is the foundation of our American political system; and

Whereas the rights and benefits of substantial home rule in the determination of municipal affairs are presently denied to the citizens of the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is considering legislation approved by the administration to assure local self-government by granting home rule to the District of Columbia; and

Whereas such legislation has the support of the Board of Commissioners of the District, a substantial majority of its residents and the U.S. Conference of Mayors among others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is urged to grant the right of determination of local affairs to the people of the District of Columbia through the passage of legislation of the type proposed by the administration and introduced by Congressman HENRY S. REUSS which provides a territorial form of government for the District; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Congressmen whose districts include the city of Milwaukee.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee on July 21, 1959.

STANLEY J. WITKOWSKI,
City Clerk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2471. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 607).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 5138. An act to extend the grounds of the Custis-Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery (Rept. No. 618).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1448. A bill to change the name of the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park at Hodgenville, Ky., to Abraham Lincoln's Birthplace (Rept. No. 617).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1216. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 610); and

H.R. 4405. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on the feasibility of developing the water resources of the Salt Fork and the Prairie Dog Town Fork of the Red River in the State of Texas (Rept. No. 611).

By Mr. NEUBERGER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1221. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands (Rept. No. 609); and

H.R. 968. An act to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Bully Creek Dam and other facilities, Vale Federal reclamation project, Oregon (Rept. No. 608).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1514. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 618) (Rept. No. 612).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1136. A bill to provide for transfer of title to irrigation distribution systems constructed under the Federal reclamation laws upon completion of repayment of the costs thereof (Rept. No. 613).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 258. A bill to provide for certain reductions in the reimbursable construction cost of the Kittitas division of the Yakima reclamation project, Washington (Rept. No. 614); and

H.R. 3335. An act to provide for the apportionment by the Secretary of the Interior of certain costs of the Yakima Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 615).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 3682. An act to permit the processing of certain applications under the Small Tracts Act for lands included in the Caribou and Targhee National Forests by the act of August 14, 1958 (Rept. No. 619).

By Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 713. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Zion National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 616).

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD, RELATING TO ACTIVITIES OF JAMES R. HOFFA AND INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS (S. REPT. NO. 620)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, pursuant to Senate Resolution 44, Eighty-sixth Congress, I am filing today with the Senate the committee's findings on the activities of James R. Hoffa and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. I intend to file tomorrow the committee's factual summary with relation to the Hoffa testimony, in addition to factual summaries and findings relating to Allen Dorfman, the Union Insurance Agency of Illinois, the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. of New York, and two locals of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union in New York City. This is a part of the total report of the committee's activities for the year 1958. Other portions of the report are currently being considered by members of the committee and will be filed as soon as approved. These findings more than ever put the responsibility squarely on Congress to enact legislation to deal with these serious problems. I am hopeful that the House will pass the kind of bill necessary to effectively remedy the unwholesome conditions uncovered by the committee and exemplified by this report and others that will be made by the committee in the near future.

I ask that the report be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Col. Howard A. Morris, Corps of Engineers, to be a member and secretary of the California Debris Commission; and

Frank A. Augsbury, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2481. A bill to continue the application of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, to certain functions relating to fishing vessels transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. ENGLE) (by request):

S. 2482. A bill to remove geographical limitations on activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; and

S. 2483. A bill to provide flexibility in the performance of certain functions of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and of the Weather Bureau; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2484. A bill for the relief of Franc Molka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 2485. A bill to authorize the sale of 40 acres of land owned by the Creek Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2486. A bill for the relief of Nobuko Stickles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 2487. A bill to provide for greater competitive distribution throughout private industry of the economic benefits flowing from preparing the Nation's defense, to improve the opportunities for small business concerns to participate as subcontractors in Government procurement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 2488. A bill to authorize the procurement of certain aircraft for training of the Air Force Reserve and for the transportation of ground combat units in time of war or emergency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 2489. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Aquino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. SYMINGTON submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) favoring action by the President looking to a settlement of the pending steel strike, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full, when submitted by Mr. SYMINGTON, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS INCURRED BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 155); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That not to exceed $4,500 of funds made available to the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field by Senate Resolution 44, agreed to February 2, 1959 is hereby made available for obligations incurred under authority of Senate Resolution 221, agreed to January 29, 1958 as amended.

CONTINUATION OF APPLICATION OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936 TO FUNCTIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN FISHING VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to continue the application of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, to certain functions relating to fishing vessels transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2481) to continue the application of the Merchant Marine Act

of 1936, as amended, to certain functions relating to fishing vessels transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1959.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill "to continue the application of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, to certain functions relating to fishing vessels transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes."

We recommend that this proposal be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and that it be enacted.

In accordance with the authority contained in section 6 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1122; 16 U.S.C., 1952 ed., sec. 742(c)), the functions formerly exercised by the Secretary of Commerce relating to the issuance of Federal ship mortgage insurance on fishing vessels authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 were transferred to this Department (23 F.R. 2304).

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to permit the efficient execution of the transferred functions by continuing the application of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, subsequent to the transfer of these functions. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 authorizes the issuance of Federal ship mortgage insurance on all types of passenger, cargo, and combination passenger-cargo carrying vessels, tugs, towboats, barges, and dredges documented under the laws of the United States, as well as fishing vessels owned by citizens of the United States. While this function, so far as it relates to fishing vessels, has been transferred to this Department, the authority to insure construction loans and mortgages on vessels other than fishing vessels remains in the Secretary of Commerce.

By the terms of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, the Federal ship mortgage insurance fund is used as a revolving fund for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act. The act authorizes a premium charge for the insurance of loans and mortgages, as well as a charge for the investigation of applications for insurance, the appraisal of properties offered for insurance, the issuance of commitments, and for the inspection of properties during construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning. Funds so received are deposited in the revolving fund. The act further provides that "the faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of interest on the unpaid balance of the principal amount of each mortgage or loan insured under this title." In the event of default of the payment of principal and interest by the mortgagor, the insured mortgagee may demand payment of an amount equal to the unpaid principal and accrued interest from the United States. Upon an offer by the mortgagee to assign the loan or mortgage within 30 days after demand, the Secretary of Commerce, or the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the transferred function, is required to accept the assignment and promptly pay to the lender the unpaid principal amount of the loan and unpaid interest thereon to the date of payment.

At the time the functions of the Secretary of Commerce relating to mortgage insurance on fishing vessels were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, subsection (b) of section 1105 provided that "any amount required to be paid by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be paid in cash." Subsequently, however, due to a special need that arose on the part of the Department of Commerce, the act was amended on July 15, 1958 (Public Law 85–520, 72 Stat. 358). This amendment was designed to implement the pledge of faith clause by providing a means for paying amounts required to be paid under subsection (a) of section 1105 when moneys in the revolving fund are insufficient. Section 1105(b) was amended by inserting at the end thereof the following sentences:

"If at any time the moneys in the Federal ship mortgage insurance fund authorized by section 1102 of this act are not sufficient to pay any amount the Secretary of Commerce is required to pay by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities and subject to such forms and conditions that may be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield and outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes or other obligations to be issued hereunder and for such purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Funds borrowed under this section shall be deposited in the Federal ship mortgage insurance fund and redemptions of such notes or obligations shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce from such fund."

We have published in the Federal Register notice of rulemaking covering the fishing vessel mortgage insurance program; however, we find that it is difficult if not impossible to carry out the transferred functions. The July 15, 1958, amendment of the Merchant Marine Act, which we have quoted, specifically confers authority upon the Secretary of Commerce to make definite arrangements with the Secretary of the Treasury for the payment of any defaults that may arise in connection with the mortgage insurance activities. Due to the fact that the transfer of the functions, relating to fishing vessels preceded the amendment in question, there is doubt that the latest amendment of the act applies to this Department. In any event, in carrying out our functions under the act, there would be insufficient funds in the early stages of our operations to pay off a claim unless there were an initial appropriation made to the fund. Such an appropriation, however, would tie up Government funds for an unspecified length of time with no indication that such funds would ever be needed.

In the foregoing circumstances, we consider that the procedure set forth in the latest amendment to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 should be made applicable to our functions as well as to the functions of the Secretary of Commerce under the act. We have discussed this program relating to the mortgage insurance on fishing vessels with six banks and three insurance companies. These firms have indicated some degree of interest in the program; however, we are informed that all except two of the banks would refuse to accept this mortgage insurance on fishing vessels unless we can give them assurance that funds will be available to pay off promptly, in accordance with the terms of the act, any claims that may be caused by a default. In this connection, it should be noted that a claim for a default would not necessarily indicate a net loss to the fund as the collateral may be sufficient to pay the entire amount of the claim upon liquidation thereof. If we are to carry out the purposes of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in carrying out the mortgage insurance functions relating to fishing vessels that have been transferred to us, it is essential that we be in a position to pay promptly any claims that may result from such mortgage insurance.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS LEFFLER,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

REMOVAL OF GEOGRAPHICAL LIMITATIONS ON ACTIVITIES OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove geographical limitations on activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement in support of the proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2482) to remove geographical limitations on activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. ENGLE), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO REMOVE GEOGRAPHICAL LIMITATIONS ON ACTIVITIES OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The act of August 6, 1947, which provides basic authority for the activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey authorizes surveys, observations, measurements, and charting activities in the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to clarify ambiguous language in the act of August 6, 1947, and to provide statutory authority for the Secretary of Commerce to conduct activities listed in that act without regard to the geographical limitations set forth therein in connection with projects designated essential to the national interest by the head of an executive department or agency.

The rapid development of the exploration of outer space, the impelling need for increasing our knowledge of the oceans, and the increasing range of scientific investigation and study generally require, for maximum effectiveness, the gathering of increasingly detailed and more widespread geophysical data, which includes geodesy,

oceanography, seismology, and geomagnetism. The Coast and Geodetic Survey as a Government agency primarily responsible for surveys in these fields has experienced a rapidly increasing demand for its services in connection with these activities. Many of these requests require data relating to geographical locations and geophysical phenomena which can be obtained only from surveys, observations, measurements, or investigations outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions. Under the geographical restrictions set forth in the 1947 act, the Coast and Geodetic Survey is unable to collect through its own field parties such data and regardless of the necessity in the national interest for precise data is forced to rely upon other sources for the necessary observations, surveys, measurements, and investigations with no control over methods, standards of accuracy, or priorities to be established for the various projects.

The oceanographic program as proposed by the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council, which is now being considered by the Congress, recommends that the Coast and Geodetic Survey be responsible for half of the deep-ocean surveys. The inclusion of the geographical restrictions in the 1947 act poses a question as to whether or not the Coast and Geodetic Survey has the legal authority to conduct hydrographic and oceanographic surveys on the high seas. This question is raised by the ambiguity of the phrase "(including surveys of off-lying islands, banks, shoals, and other offshore areas)" in section 1(1) of the act.

A question is also raised by the inclusion of the geographical limitations in section 1 as to whether or not the Coast and Geodetic Survey has the authority to conduct the activities enumerated in that section in areas outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions as a reimbursable project for another department or agency in accordance with section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686).

The proposed legislation would authorize the Coast and Geodetic Survey to carry out its activities without regard to geographical limitations whenever the head of an executive agency determines the project to be essential to the national interest.

Since the enactment of the enclosed draft bill would not, in the foreseeable future, entail annual expenditure of appropriated funds in excess of $1 million, the provisions of Public Law 801, 84th Congress, are not applicable.

FLEXIBILITY IN PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY AND WEATHER BUREAU

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide flexibility in the performance of certain functions of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and of the Weather Bureau. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of purpose and need of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2483) to provide flexibility in the performance of certain functions of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and of the Weather Bureau, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. ENGLE), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the bill is to make possible simplification of appropriation act language and to provide flexibility in the legal provisions under which the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau, in the Department of Commerce, carry out certain functions relating to oceanographic observations, seismograph observations, magnetic observations, meteorological observations and meteorological investigations in the Arctic region.

Section 2 of the act of July 22, 1947, 61 Stat. 400, 33 U.S.C. 873, authorized the Coast and Geodetic Survey to pay extra compensation to members of crews of vessels when assigned duties as bombers or fathometer readers, and to employees of other Federal agencies while observing tides or currents or tending seismographs, at such rates as may be specified from time to time in the appropriation concerned.

During the intervening years, it has been necessary each year to incorporate in the appropriation for the Coast and Geodetic Survey language fixing the above-mentioned rates. This has resulted in an unnecessary and undesirable complication of the appropriation act language. In addition, the rate incorporated in the appropriation act language tends to become fixed and inadequate in the light of changing times and conditions. Necessary adjustments from time to time require the attention of the Congress, even though they are of negligible significance compared with the many important questions of public policy which urgently require the attention of the Congress.

To remedy this difficulty and provide necessary flexibility, it is proposed in section 1 of the bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to fix the rates rather than to require them to be specified in appropriation acts.

Section 1 of the bill would also correct certain obsolete language. In view of technological advances in the nature of the work concerned, the phrase in the present law "assigned duties as bombers or fathometer readers" would be changed to "assigned duties as instrument observer or recorder", and "tending seismographs" would be changed to "tending seismographs or magnetographs".

The Weather Bureau has a similar but somewhat more complex problem. Section 3 of the act of June 2, 1948, 62 Stat. 286, 15 U.S.C. 327, authorized the Weather Bureau to (a) grant extra compensation to employees of other Government agencies for taking and transmitting meteorological observations, and (b) appoint employees for the conduct of meteorological investigations in the Arctic region without regard to the civil service and classification laws and titles II and III of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, both at base rates which shall not exceed such maximum rates as may be specified from time to time in the appropriation concerned.

The foregoing language makes it necessary to specify the rates mentioned in the appropriation language each year. This unnecessarily complicates the appropriation language, fixes the rates in relatively rigid form, and makes it necessary to take up the time of the Congress in consideration of adjustments in such rates. In addition, the section as enacted in 1948 contained an exception from the classification laws. This exemption was nullified by the Classification Act of 1949, and it has been necessary to reenact it each year in the annual appropriation act.

The additional complexity in the appropriation act resulting from the necessity of including these details is reflected by the fact that two-thirds of the appropriation act language is devoted to a proviso setting forth these details.

Section 2 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe the rates concerned, at base rates not to exceed the maximum scheduled rate for GS–12, and would reenact on a continuing basis the exemption from the classification laws which is now dependent on annual appropriation acts.

Changes in the rates now specified in the appropriation acts are urgently needed. The Coast and Geodetic Survey reports that it is no longer practicable in numerous localities to obtain the services required for only $1 a day, the rate now authorized by statute. An increase in the rate to $5 a day is now essential. The Weather Bureau reports it is no longer practicable in many localities to obtain the services required for only $5 a day. An increase in the rate to $8 a day is now required.

Enactment of the bill would make it possible to simplify the appropriation act for the two appropriations concerned, provide much-needed flexibility in the periodic adjustment of the rates, and eliminate the necessity for asking the Congress to legislate on what are essentially minor details of administration.

SETTLEMENT OF CURRENT STEEL STRIKE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a large majority of the American people approve President Eisenhower's invitation to Mr. Khrushchev to visit the United States next month.

We hope that this visit will impress on him the basic strength of this country; and that this impression will be reflected in his subsequent conduct in the field of foreign policy.

This new development gives an important additional reason for a prompt settlement of the already 3 weeks old steel strike.

Therefore, I submit for appropriate reference a Senate concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President take certain actions in the national security and welfare to settle this strike.

I ask unanimous consent that this concurrent resolution remain at the desk through Friday, August 7, to permit additional Senators to associate themselves with it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Missouri.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas the current strike in the steel industry has already caused widespread unemployment, reduced national production, and resulted in great financial loss to steelworkers, to steel companies, and to related industries; and also heavy loss of revenue to the Government;

Whereas such strike, if prolonged, will affect the national security and welfare;

Whereas these circumstances create an overriding public interest in the speediest possible settlement of such strike;

Whereas the parties having reached an impasse, assistance from the Government is therefore necessary to encourage speedy settlement of the strike within the framework of free collective bargaining;

Whereas the deadlock results from a basic dispute between the parties as to the facts bearing upon the issues, and also from disagreement between the parties as to what course of settlement will best serve the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress:

That the President of the United States use the prestige and influence of his high office in an effort to obtain promptly a reasonable settlement.

SEC. 2. That he invite the responsible principals in the steel dispute to meet with him in order to impress upon them their primary responsibility to the Nation to conclude an early and reasonable settlement;

SEC. 3. That the President should set an early date at which, in the absence of a fair and reasonable settlement, he will take further action; and

SEC. 4. That upon failure of the parties to conclude a settlement by that date, the President should apoint an impartial Board, headed by public figures, with established reputations, to ascertain the facts with respect to the dispute; and to make public a full and complete report of such facts, with recommendations as to terms of settlement of the dispute which will best serve the national interest and be fair and equitable to both parties.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO STATE OF ILLINOIS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 747) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands known as the Des Plaines Public Hunting and Refuge Area to the State of Illinois, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO FILLING OF TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEATING submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 117) to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to James Madison, introduced by me on July 7, 1959.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION AMENDING THE NATIONAL BANKING LAWS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and as chairman of its Subcommittee on Banking, I wish to announce the commencement of hearings on legislation amending the national banking laws. The proposed legislation consists of the following bills:

H.R. 8159, by Mr. BROWN of Georgia, to amend the national banking laws to clarify or eliminate ambiguities, to repeal certain laws which have become obsolete, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8160, by Mr. BROWN of Georgia, to amend the lending and borrowing limitations applicable to national banks, to authorize the appointment of an additional Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, and for other purposes.

It is my intention to hold hearings on these bills prior to adjournment of the Congress, on a day or days to be determined later. In the meantime all persons who wish to appear and testify at hearings on these bills are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief of staff, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, as soon as possible.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO REGULATE SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANIES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and as chairman of its Subcommittee on Banking, I wish to announce the commencement of hearings on legislation to regulate savings and loan holding companies. The proposed legislation consists of the following bill:

H.R. 7244, to promote and preserve local management of savings and loan associations by protecting them against encroachment by holding companies.

It is my intention to hold hearings on this bill prior to adjournment of the Congress, on a day or days to be determined later. In the meantime all persons who wish to appear and testify at hearings on this bill are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief of staff, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, as soon as possible.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BYRON E. BLANKINSHIP AND 146 OTHER FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate today received the nominations of Byron E. Blankinship and 146 other Foreign Service officers, for promotion.

In accordance with the committee rule, the pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days.

DEATH OF MRS. WILLIAM LANGER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I announce to the Senate the death of Mrs. William Langer, the wife of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

It was my pleasure to know her well. Never in my lifetime have I encountered any person at once so gracious and so kindly as Mrs. Langer. Her passing comes as a great shock to the family, and to all the friends of the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, it is with the deepest sorrow that I learn of the passing of Mrs. Langer.

Mrs. Langer was one of the most outstanding and wonderful women I have ever known. Surely, no one could have been a finer mother of a most lovable family.

Lydia Langer enjoyed the respect and admiration of all the people of North Dakota and wherever people came to know her.

On behalf of Mrs. Young and myself may I extend our deepest sympathy to Senator LANGER and his lovable family.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am deeply distressed, as I know every other Member of the Senate is, to learn of the passing of Mrs. Langer.

She was a good lady, a wonderful person, a fine companion, and a friend of many Members of this body and their wives.

To her husband and the others she leaves behind, we extend our deep sympathy and our great respect.

Mrs. Johnson joins me in this solace to the members of this distinguished family.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I join in the sympathetic expressions which have been made on the passing of Lydia Langer. Everyone who knew her felt that here was a real woman. Of course, the family and BILL will miss that fine influence.

We extend to them all our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Illinois and other Senators in expressing sympathy to our colleague, BILL LANGER, and his fine family.

We all know the great handicap under which he has labored during recent weeks. Our hearts and prayers will be with him and his family.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a wonderful mother and wife.

I believe that my family knew Mrs. Langer and her family possibly as well as we knew any other family in Washington. She reared a fine family. We wish she were still alive. She made a great contribution to society.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of Mrs. Thurmond and myself, I extend our deepest sympathy to Senator LANGER and his family on the death

of Mrs. Langer. She was a lady of lofty character and high ideals, and had a host of friends. She will be greatly missed.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to join in these expressions of sympathy for our beloved colleague in the deep and tragic loss which he has suffered. Those of us who have known him for many years know how devoted a family man he was, and how painful the loss is.

On behalf of Mrs. Gruening and myself, I extend our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in condolences to Senator LANGER. I believe that all of us who know BILL so well know what he has been through in recent times. Our hearts go out in sympathy to him, knowing the wonderful family feeling which existed, and the fine companionship which he has treasured.

He has suffered a great loss in the death of Lydia Cady Langer, whom we all knew as a gracious and lovely lady, a fine woman, and a great spouse for our beloved colleague, BILL LANGER.

I know that every other Senator, if he were present in the Chamber, would join us in these expressions of sympathy and sincere condolences.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I express the hope and the prayer that He who marks the sparrow's fall and numbers the hairs of our heads may bring comfort to our friend BILL LANGER in this hour of deep distress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just been informed of the death of a dearly beloved friend, Mrs. Lydia Langer, the wife of the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota. Mrs. Langer was well known and beloved in Montana, because she and her husband did us the honor to visit our State on many occasions. I know that her passing will be a deep loss to the people of the middle section of the United States.

I extend deepest condolences and the most heartfelt sympathy on behalf of Mrs. Mansfield, Anne, and myself to Senator LANGER and his family in their hour of bereavement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and other Senators in extending deep sympathy to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] upon the death of his wife.

As one who knew Mrs. Langer over the years, I admired the way in which she brought up her fine family of girls. I knew her as a friend. I can appreciate very much the great loss which her death means to her husband, our colleague, Senator LANGER.

Mrs. Saltonstall joins with me in sending heartfelt sympathy to Senator LANGER in this hour of sadness.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in expressing deep sorrow over the passing of Mrs. William Langer. We who have been here for a time know that she was always thoughtful, considerate, and pleasant. She was always interested in the families of other Members of the Senate and in what was taking place in the Senate. We know of the very deep devotion which existed among the members of the Langer family—Senator LANGER, Mrs. Langer, and their daughters.

It has been my pleasure to be in their home, where I came to know Mrs. Langer quite well. I considered her to be one of the outstanding, most delightful women I have ever known in Washington.

We know also what a tremendous, shocking blow Mrs. Langer's death will be to Senator LANGER. All of us, I am certain, extend to him and their daughters our deepest sympathy. I hope he may take comfort in the knowledge that all of us will have him in mind and will wish him every blessing and comfort during the trying days of his bereavement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to express my sympathy and that of Mrs. Bridges to Senator LANGER in the loss of his wife, Lydia Cady Langer, who died today, August 4, at the George Washington University Hospital. Mrs. Bridges and I knew Mrs. Langer as a gracious lady in whose company we were delighted to be over many years. We knew her as a fine mother and wife.

I extend our sympathy also to the four daughters of Senator and Mrs. Langer and to their 12 grandchildren.

Senator LANGER and his wife were married 41 years ago, while he was attending Columbia University in New York. When death takes away a man's wife of 40 anniversaries, the loss is bound to be great, especially when his life's partner devoted herself to being wife to her husband and mother to their children.

Such a woman was Mrs. Langer.

Again, I extend deepest sympathies to Senator LANGER and his family.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues in connection with the passing of Mrs. Wiliam Langer, the wife of our distinguished senior colleague from North Dakota.

It has been my privilege to know Mrs. Langer and her wonderful family for many years. She was a gallant lady, a devoted wife, and a loving and understanding mother. I had the opportunity of visiting with her during her last illness. In this she demonstrated the best that can be found in any human being. She was courageous; she never complained; she was selfless; her only interest to the very last was what it had been during a lifetime of marriage—love and devotion to her family, her community, State, and Nation, and to her church.

Mr. President, all of this was possible by reason of her deep and devout religious faith. She was a woman of great faith, which made it possible for her to surmount great obstacles. She was a tower of strength to her husband and to her family.

Mr. President, I extend to my colleague and to his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep sympathy to the senior Senator from North Dakota in the passing of his dear wife, the former Miss Lydia Cady.

Throughout their married years Mrs. Langer was an inspiration to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, and a perfect helpmate in his political career.

Mrs. Johnston and I knew Mrs. Langer intimately and treasured her friendship. We know the great void that will be left in the Langer family because of her passing.

I extend deepest sympathy to the senior Senator of North Dakota and his lovely family.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mrs. Morse and I are deeply saddened to learn of the death of Mrs. William Langer today. Lydia, as she was known to us, was a wonderful and gracious woman and we shall miss her very much. To Senator LANGER, and to the family, Mrs. Morse and I express our deep sympathy. Our prayers go with them at this time of sorrow.

When we first came to the Senate and commenced our services here Mrs. Langer extended many, many courtesies to Mrs. Morse. A beautiful friendship developed between them.

SOLDIERS AS SERVANTS: A BAD PRACTICE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Daily Press reports and I have heard that officers in the military services of our country have been making rather wide use of enlisted personnel as servants and flunkies.

In the mail this week, I received from one of my constituents in Alaska a bulletin which apparently was posted at one of our Air Force bases in my State. The bulletin explains itself. It says:

> Request volunteers for the position of airman's aide to colonel. * * * Airmen must meet the following requirements: Neat in appearance; some knowledge of cooking; know how to tend bar; single or unaccompanied. Should be an airman, first class, or staff sergeant. Those interested are to contact the first sergeant not later than 1200 hours, 21 July 1959.

This announcement is signed by a master sergeant of the U.S. Air Force.

The constituent who sent it to me, who I suspect may be one of our servicemen who did not volunteer for this glamorous position, cooking and tending bar for the colonel, appended a note which asked:

> Is this the way our boys are trained to defend our country? Is this how our tax money is used?

I should like to ask those same questions here in the Senate of the United States. If a mere "chicken colonel" rates an aide who must know both how to cook and how to tend bar, I am wondering what kind of servants we are furnishing at the taxpayers' expense to generals in the armed services.

Mr. President, it would appear that the practice of which the bulletin I have quoted is an evidence is widespread. In one of the newspaper columns last week I noted an allegation that even President Eisenhower, presumably because of his position as Commander in Chief, has had as many as 10 servicemen assigned to him to perform duties of mess boys and servants at the White House. I hesitate to believe that such a situation could exist, and I hope a denial from the White House will be forthcoming soon.

Mr. President, I think we all share the view that the young men who are called into the service of our country as soldiers, sailors and airmen should not be used as servants of the officer class. If the "brass" desires such domestic service, they should hire it from civilian ranks and pay for it. Certainly the pay of a colonel or higher ranking officer is adequate to afford such personal domestic service if it is desired. I am sure that such culinary and beverage dispensing service can be obtained from the Culinary Workers' Union and Bartenders' Union without difficulty. I feel that this practice further emphasizes a caste and class distinction between officers and enlisted men which runs counter to our democratic principles. In addition to the other objectionable aspects of calling upon men in uniform to perform personal domestic service for their officers is that it is another variation of Government competition with private enterprise. I have written to the Secretary of the Air Force for an explanation of this instance from my own State which has just come to my attention.

The distraught mother who once might have said, "I did not raise my boy to be a soldier," could, I feel, just as truly today plead, "I did not raise my boy to tend bar, or cook for a colonel, or be an officer's chauffeur, or caddy for a general on a golf course."

I hope this practice will be terminated promptly and voluntarily by action of those in charge of our military services before the citizens of America rise up and demand that that be done.

NEW YORK STATE CONTRIBUTORS TO AMERICAN NATIONAL EXHIBIT IN MOSCOW

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the American National Exhibition in Moscow has been a very considerable success. This has been evident in the tremendous throngs of Russians who have viewed it, and in the frantic efforts of Moscow's propagandists to depreciate it.

I am proud to note that many New York firms and individuals have made substantial contributions to the success of this exhibition.

George Nelson & Co., of New York, were chief designers for the exhibit, responsible for all interior and exterior displays. Nelson also designed the plastic pavilions, which were constructed by Lunn Laminates, Inc., of Huntington, Long Island. The exhibition hall was fabricated and erected by Reynolds-Feal Co., of New York and Milan, Italy. The landscape architect and site planner for the exhibition was the New York firm of Robert Zion and Harold Breen.

Thirty-three New York firms were among those contributing to the packaging display at the exhibition. I ask unanimous consent that their names be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Corning Glass Works, Corning; Rek-O-Kut Co., Inc., Corona; Pan American World Airways, Jamaica; Patricia Murphy Greenhouse Perfumes, Mount Vernon; Bristol-Myers Co., New York; Bloomingdale Bros., New York; Lord & Taylor, New York; Masterset Brush Co., New York; Vonder Lancken & Lindquist, New York; Harry & Marion Zelenko, New York; Raymond Loewy Association, Inc., New York; Pantasote Co., New York; Capital Records, New York; S. Neil Fujita, New York; Donald Deskey Associates, New York; Dixie Cup Co., New York; Precision Valve Corp., Yonkers; Ed-U-Cards, Long Island City; Equitable Paper Bag, Long Island City; El Producto, Long Island City; Hudson Pulp & Paper Co., New York; Laverne Originals, New York; Elizabeth Arden Sales Corp., New York; Bergdorf Goodman Co., New York; Imco Container Corp., New York; Plax Corp., New York; American Machine & Foundry Co., Inc., New York; Revlon, Inc., New York; Harry Lapow Associates, New York; Prestige Records, Inc., New York; Mercury Record Corp., New York; Airkem, Inc., New York; Avon Products, Inc., New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, 15 New York firms were among those which underwrote the plastic pavilion at the exhibition. I ask unanimous consent that their names be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Allied Chemical Corp., New York; Shell Chemical Corp., New York; Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., New York; Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp., New York; Reichhold Chemicals, Inc., White Plains; Argus Chemical Corp., Brooklyn; General Products Corp., Union Springs; W. R. Grace Co., New York; American Cyanamid Co., New York; Celanese Corp. of America, New York; Hooker Chemical Corp., Niagara Falls; Union Carbide & Carbon Corp., New York; U.S. Rubber Co., New York; Claremont Pigment Dispersion Corp., Roslyn Heights; St. Regis Paper Co., New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, paintings were loaned for the fine arts exhibit at the Moscow exhibition by 19 New York museums, galleries, couples, and individuals. I ask unanimous consent that their names be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. and Mrs. William A. M. Burden, New York; Museum of Modern Art, New York; Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Whitney Museum of American Art, New York; the Honorable Mr. and Mrs. W. Averell Harriman, New York City; Brooklyn Museum; Joseph H. Hirshhorn, New York; Milton Lowenthal, New York; Munson-Williams-Proctor Institute, Utica; Rochester Memorial Art Gallery; Mr. A. Conger Goodyear, New York; Mr. Himan Brown, New York; Mrs. Phyllis B. Lambert, New York; Mr. and Mrs. Alexander Rittmaster, New York City; Kootz Gallery, New York; Mr. I. Donald Grossman, New York; Mr. Roy Neuberger, New York; Mrs. Eugene Speicher, New York; Mr. Dan R. Johnson, New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, 14 New York galleries or individals loaned sculpture. I ask unanimous consent that their names be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

World House Gallery, New York; Whitney Museum of American Art, New York; Grace Borgenicht Gallery, New York; Joseph Hirshhorn, New York; Kraushaar Galleries, New York; Robert Isaacson Gallery, New York; Pierre Matisse Gallery, New York; Perls Gallery, New York; The Artist, New York; Kootz Gallery, New York; Museum of Modern Art, New York; Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Stable Gallery, New York; Downtown Gallery, New York.

Mr. KEATING. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a list of 6 major sponsors, 20 participating sponsors, 26 cooperative sponsors, and 9 others who made New York's contribution to the American fashion display at the Moscow exhibition under the leadership of Leonard J. Hankin, executive vice president of Bergdorf Goodman, New York City.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Major sponsors (located in New York City unless otherwise noted): Fairchild Publications, Seventeen Magazine, Suzy Perette Dresses, Inc., Helena Rubinstein, Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Pendleton Woolen Mills.

Participating sponsors: Alamac Knitting Mills, American Institute of Men's & Boy's Wear, Alyssa Children's Wear, National Coat & Suit Recovery Board, Ohrbach's, Pellon Corp., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Ship and Shore, J. P. Stevens & Co., Van Raalte Co., Inc., Kramer Jewelry, Leather Industries of America, Arkay Junior Frocks, Associated Dry Goods Corp., Associated Fur Manufacturers, Inc., Berkshire Knitting Mills, Burlington Industries, Inc., Coiffures Americana, Eagle Clothes, Hart, Schaffner & Marx.

Cooperative sponsors: Allied Stores Corp., Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Montgomery Ward & Co., New York Girl Coat Co., Lou Nierenberg Corp., Palm Beach Co., Federated Dept. Stores, Sacony, Sterling Last, Long Island City, Michaels Stern & Co., W. T. Grant Co., Hat Corp of America, Hickey-Freeman Co., Rochester, LeRoi Hosiery Co., Merry Mites, Anglo Fabrics, Henri Bendel, Cluett Peabody, Cromwell Mills, Inc., Rogers Peet Co., Joseph Fligelman, Inc., Fox Knapp Mfg. Co., Gimbel Bros., H. W. Gossard Co., Zelinka-Matlick, Inc., Miles Shoes.

Other contributors: Affiliated Dress Manufacturers, Inc., National Dress Manufacturers Association, Inc., Popular Priced Dress Manufacturing Group, Inc., United Better Dress Manufacturing Association, United Popular Dress Manufacturing Association, Baker Clothes, Grossman Clothing Co., Harwood Manufacturing Co., Lustberg Nast.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, nine New York firms contributed to underwriting the costs of 3,500,000 souvenir guidebooks in Russian, and I ask unanimous consent that the names of those firms be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All-State Properties, Inc., American Express Co., Continental Can Co., Inc., General Electric Co., IBM World Trade Corp., Macy's, Republic Steel Corp., Seagrams Distillers Co., Singer Manufacturing Co.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, 18 New Yorkers were among the 75 guides selected for the exhibition, I ask unanimous consent that their names be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joan Barth, New York; Thomas Conroy, Yonkers; Sam Driver, New York; George

Feifer, New York; Paul F. Gottlieb, Long Island City; Barry F. Rubin, New York; Mrs. Elizabeth Shepard, New York; Mrs. Elizabeth Valkenier, New York; Claire de Saint-Phalle, Scarsdale; Mrs. Natasha Carlton, New York; Harris Coulter, New York; Olha Dyhdalevych, New York; Mrs. Helen Gillespie, Riverdale; Edith F. Rogovin, Buffalo; Charlotte Saikowski, New York; Andrew Swatkovsky, New York; Frederick Willerford, New York; Jane Gary, New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the photographic display of American architecture included 10 New York structures—United Nations Headquarters, the Sculpture Garden of the Museum of Modern Art, the Seagram Building, the Roosevelt Field Shopping Center on Long Island, the Greenburgh High School, the Knesses Tifereth Israel Synagogue at Port Chester, the Esso Office Building and models of Lever House and the Tishman Building in New York City, and Heathcote Elementary School in Scarsdale. And finally, I might note that the Swirl Co. of New York made the yellow-and-white striped dresses worn by the girls serving free Pepsi-Cola at the exhibition.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished junior Senator from New York for compiling this information. I think it is most desirable. It is a matter of great State pride for us that individuals and companies in the State of New York have participated in this way.

I saw the fashion exhibit at the Institute of Fashion Technology in New York before the exhibit was sent to Moscow. It was tremendously impressive. It showed the resourcefulness and creativity of the ready-to-wear industry in New York. I think our State has every reason to be very proud.

I am very grateful to the junior Senator from New York for having amassed this information and for placing it in the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the senior Senator from New York for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

HELP FOR THE SELF-EMPLOYED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for a number of years it has been apparent that the tax treatment accorded self-employed persons with regard to their retirement savings is not comparable to the application of the laws to employees covered by employer-financed pension plans. Within budgetary limitations, this imbalance should be rectified. I sponsored similar legislation in the House of Representatives for several years.

In this connection, a clear and strong presentation of the need for H.R. 10 and the ramifications of statutory changes in this field recently appeared in the New York Herald Tribune. It was written by an expert in the field, and provides valuable information for those concerned with the need for special help for our self-employed. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 12, 1959]

PENSION TAX BREAK LOOMS

(By Henry T. Vance)

Some 10 million self-employed Americans may soon receive a highly important tax concession in the form of tax deductible pension plans.

This is what is being sought under the Keogh-Simpson bill, which passed the House of Representatives last March and is now awaiting Senate action.

While there have been no indications as to how the Senate Finance Committee might act on this bill, its outlook at this time is perhaps more favorable than at any time since 1951, when Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, of New York, first introduced a bill with this objective.

In fact, many mutual fund sponsors, including Vance, Sanders & Co., Inc., which distributes Boston Fund, Massachusetts Investors Trust, and three other funds, have joined leading banks and insurance companies in preparing to offer plans when the bill is passed.

The plan being considered by Vance, Sanders offers a simple and flexible feature whereby self-employed individuals may use mutual fund shares in setting up a restricted retirement trust fund.

The Keogh-Simpson bill—Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, is cosponsor—would provide that self-employed individuals subject to income taxes under section 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code be allowed a tax concession on a maximum of 10 percent of earned income, not to exceed $2,500 annually or $50,000 in their lifetime. This exemption would be granted if they became members of a qualified pension fund. The benefits under the plan would be subject to a tax upon retirement.

PENSION PLANS SPREAD

The project of providing employees with income for their retirement years has grown rapidly in recent years. About one worker out of three today is covered by either a profit-sharing or pension plan at an estimated annual cost of some $5 billion. This is more than 15 times greater than in 1940. This growth has been sparked, of course, by special deferred tax benefits. Unfortunately today's doctors, lawyers, and other businessmen who are self-employed do not qualify for the tax benefits available to businesses and their employees under Internal Revenue-approved plans. Hence, the proposed Keogh legislation, which also is known as the self-employed individuals' retirement act of 1959.

The Keogh bill simply seeks to give the self-employed an opportunity to build a retirement nest egg along with a tax deferrment while he is doing so. The professional or businessman wants to live as comfortably in his retirement years as his brother employees of private industry. The trouble now is that the private industry employee can build his nest egg while the self-employed cannot.

This inequity, incidentally, has been done away with in both Great Britain and Canada in recent years. Can the United States be far behind?

TWO METHODS

There are two principal ways in which amounts may be contributed to a self-employment pension plan: One, a restricted retirement policy, and two, the aforementioned restricted retirement fund.

The first plan must be a contract issued by a life insurance company with the proviso for payment of retirement benefits. The second merely means a trust is established under a retirement plan for the benefit of one or more participants. The trustee must be a bank, and the investments of the trust are limited to stock or securities listed on a registered exchange, stock of a regulated investment company (mutual fund) or Government bonds.

There is, however, a move afoot to permit banks to serve as custodians, rather than trustees, where the retirement fund is invested in shares of regulated investment companies or Government obligations. This would give mutual funds equal status with banks and insurance companies in providing a complete plan for self-employed persons.

HOW IT WORKS

For example, shares of a mutual fund, under accumulation programs, are already held in custody by banks. A plan holder could merely segregate holdings, to the extent possible, under a qualified trust established for that purpose.

The Treasury Department has already given evidence of its approval to the custodian account concept by stating: "To reduce the cost of participating in the plan, an exception might be made for certain types of investment which do not appear to need the services of a trustee. For example, individuals might be permitted to purchase stock in a regulated investment company directly without the use of a trustee, provided there are appropriate safeguards and the company agrees to provide the Government with information regarding purchases and sales of its stocks under the plan."

Whether the Keogh bill is enacted this year or not, it appears that equitable tax treatment for the millions of self-employed Americans is on the way.

CANCELLATION OF HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION BY NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. KEATING. A report in today's New York Times notes that the New York Department of Public Works has canceled the scheduled awarding Thursday of $36 million worth of highway construction. The reason given for this action is that the payment of Federal highway funds is to be discontinued after August 1 of this year.

Mr. President, this report points up the urgency of congressional action to permit the continuation of our Federal highway program. The need for more and better highways is of the highest priority. New York State's announcement, cutting back its highway program, reflects a dilemma that confronts every State of the Union. Before this situation is allowed to bring our national highway program to a total halt, we must take action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALT ON AID CURBS STATE ROAD WORK—UNITED STATES ENDS PLEDGE OF SHARE IN COSTS AND $36,800,000 CONTRACTS ARE STOPPED

(By Warren Weaver Jr.)

ALBANY, August 3.—The State public works department called off today the scheduled awarding Thursday of $36,800,000 worth of highway contracts.

It also deferred indefinitely State's 1959–60 program that involved Federal funds. Affected are 9 of 10 highway contracts.

The actions were based on notice to the State over the weekend that no Federal aid payments could be guaranteed for State contracts let after August 1.

The Federal Bureau of Public Roads sent word that Congress had not yet made any move to replenish the Federal highway trust fund, from which aid payments are made to the States.

SUFFOLK PROJECTS VOIDED

Among the 14 contracts being withdrawn are 2 in Suffolk County.

One would have provided $4,016,000 for a 4-mile, four-lane section of the Sunrise Highway Extension between Hampton Bays and Shinnecock Hills, together with more than 5 miles of access roads. The other proposed $1,444,000 for reconstruction of a 2-mile, four-lane section of Route 110 from Amityville north to the Southern State Parkway, including the demolition of 31 buildings.

Other major highway projects stalled are a $10,064,000 6-mile segment of Route 17 east of Binghamton and more than 10 miles and $13 million worth of the new Empire Stateway, to run from the Pennsylvania border to the Thousand Islands.

The State superintendent of public works, J. Burch McMorran, announced also that the State had already committed the spending of more than $20 million on highway projects for which Federal aid would normally be forthcoming but had not yet been guaranteed. The State expected to learn later this week whether the Federal trust fund had the resources to cover the aid for these projects.

Technically, Washington officials have already allocated Federal highway aid for the Federal fiscal year that ends next July 1. What they lack in money in the trust fund to allocate now for the 1960–61 fiscal year.

However, New York and a number of other States have used their own money to meet the Federal share of highway project costs in anticipation of reimbursement.

This State has a large stake in continuation of the Federal program. With the Federal Government paying 90 percent of the cost of interstate highway construction the State would expect to receive next year about $125 million in aid and $55 million in aid for other programs.

The proposed 1959–60 State program involves expenditures of $303,700,000. Contracts for only about $87 million worth of work have been let since the State fiscal year began April 1. About 90 percent of the program involves some Federal aid.

Two State public works officials conferred with Federal highway officials in Washington last week and delivered to Mr. McMorran the notice of the August 1 cutoff of guaranteed aid.

Acquisition of rights-of-way for Federal-aid highways is also being halted.

FIGHTING DISEASE ON A WORLD-WIDE BASIS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the resolution to authorize American participation in an international crusade to stamp out disease and pestilence, which has passed the Senate, I am extremely hopeful the other body will act on this matter before this session ends. By means of the International Health and Medical Research Act, the United States can assert the kind of leadership which will not only pay off in healthier, happier lives for people everywhere, but will also contribute substantially to the cause of world peace.

Two opening witnesses appearing on the House side have made impressive presentations of the need for this new agency. In an editorial published this morning, the Washington Post states succinctly the need for congressional action to make possible American leadership in this field. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 4, 1959]

MOBILIZING RESEARCH

There are two compelling arguments in support of the proposed International Health and Medical Research Act which the Senate adopted and on which House hearings are now being held. The act would add to the research institutes of the U.S. Public Health Service a new agency to promote, coordinate and finance the war against disease on a worldwide basis. The lead-off witnesses in favor of the proposal, General of the Army Omar Bradley and Dr. Howard Rusk, made an impressive case for such an agency.

In the fight against disease, as Dr. Rusk pointed out, the United States has no monopoly on creative imagination, ingenuity and research potentials. The new agency would operate, in effect, to weld an alliance among researchers working now in isolation and often in ignorance of each other's efforts. It would help workers in other lands handicapped now by lack of funds. It would unite an attack now made disconnectedly and thus enhance its effectiveness. In addition, the proposed agency would have great utility in reaffirming to the world the interest of the United States in the welfare of mankind without regard to national boundaries. This is a kind of leadership in world affairs which Americans must ardently desire their country to assert.

NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am much pleased to note that the conferees on the Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1960, have agreed to appropriate $35 million for long-leadtime items in connection with proposed construction of a nuclear aircraft carrier. This action is well conceived, and is the result of the leadership of the Senate on the recommendation of the Senate Appropriations Committee, in making provision for a nuclear-powered carrier.

It takes account of the manifold responsibilities of our country whose policy must be backed up by the necessary military forces. This nuclear carrier underlines the fact that our commitments extend to limited regional security problems as well as to the dread possibility of an all-out conflict. Furthermore, there is much strategic thinking that in terms of total defense a nuclear carrier with its long staying power at sea and with new types of weapons can have enormous deterrent capability.

It is now timely to point out that there is no better place to build such a carrier than at the "can do" yard, the Brooklyn Navy Yard. The Brooklyn Navy Yard is distinguished by a long career of superior performance in the construction of naval vessels, including particularly aircraft carriers. A case in point is the recently completed *Independence*, which I had the honor of inspecting and of being present at its commissioning.

The large force of skilled workers at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, backed by the resources of the greatest city in the world, is ready to take on the job and to carry it through to completion with distinction. The Brooklyn Navy Yard has not been allotted its full and fair share of naval construction work. My colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I and the whole congressional delegation from New York have been making that point constantly with our defense authorities. The loyal force of workers at the yard is ready to assume the task of building a nuclear carrier, and I earnestly hope that the job will be awarded to the "can do" Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I trust the Senator will also take note of the Charleston Navy Yard. That yard is prepared to do the work, and South Carolina would be glad to have it done there. The building facilities could be expanded there and probably the carriers could be built at less expense.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I express my gratification over the action taken authorizing this nuclear carrier. I emphatically join with the senior Senator from New York in his fine presentation of the capabilities of the New York naval shipyard. It has the skilled workmen, adequate ways, and all the other necessary equipment. It seems to me that yard is the logical place for this carrier to be built.

I know that my colleague from New York, who has worked shoulder to shoulder with the other members of the New York congressional delegation in trying to bring this about, will continue his fine efforts to this end.

Mr. JAVITS. I may say to our colleague from South Carolina that there are only a very few yards in the country able to build a ship of this size and character, indeed, and my information is there are only two, but if Charleston is one of them, then God bless the Charleston yard for its capabilities.

However, I respectfully submit that in the Brooklyn Navy Yard we have the skilled workers, we have the space, and we have the experience needed. It is no derogation of any other yard if we put in our bid most strongly.

Mr. KEATING. And the New York naval shipyard needs the work.

Mr. JAVITS. It needs the work.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We certainly do not object to the Senators putting in their bid, but we also put in our bid for Charleston, S.C.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have the honor to suggest that if the Defense Department would like to build this great new carrier in California, we will be glad to accommodate them, and if we need any additional tools to do the job, we will try to arrange to get them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The regular order has been requested. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina.

PROTECTION OF AMERICAN INVESTMENTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, recently, the Cologne, Germany, Society To Advance the Protection of Private Foreign Investments issued a statement calling attention to the need for action such as that which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I sought to undertake in connection with the passage of the mutual security authorization bill.

Our amendment, in its original form, would have permitted the President to deny future foreign aid to any nation which expropriated or confiscated U.S.-owned property without paying adequate compensation.

The Cologne society, in its statement, also reminds us that the Federal Government of Germany has written provisions into its budget law that would seek to protect foreign investments against illegal encroachments.

Inasmuch as I consider this entire question to be of vital importance in the entire area of economic aid abroad, I wish to bring the statement of the Cologne society to the attention of my colleagues at this time, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLOGNE, GERMANY, *July 22, 1959.*

The Society To Advance the Protection of Private Foreign Investments today cited adoption by the U.S. Senate of the Bridges-Johnston amendment to the Mutual Security Act as proof of the fact that Germany has strong support in the United States in its belief in the sanctity of private property.

At the same time, the society praised the Federal Government of Germany for adopting provisions to the Federal budget law which seek to protect foreign investments against illegal encroachments.

These provisions set up guarantees, warranties or other assurances for private investors against political risks, provided the foreign investments involved are worth supporting.

The guarantees, warranties, or other assurances, however, would be dependent upon whether or not the country in which the investment is to be made has made an agreement with the Federal Republic providing for the protection of such capital investment either by agreement or other means.

The society added:

"This manifests the principle laid down by international law, and, consequently, also in the constitutions and trade agreements of many countries according to which foreign properties may not be taken from the investors by expropriation or similar actions unless there is prompt, adequate, and effective compensation. This is also one of the principles embedded in the draft for a multilateral convention drawn up by the society for the protection of private foreign investments in collaboration with similar groups representing England, France, and Switzerland. This draft, which is designed not only to protect future, but also presently existing foreign investments, states—in agreement with existing rules of international law—that expropriations which do not correspond to the aforementioned conditions are unlawful.

"That Germany is not the only country advocating this idea is shown by the Bridges-Johnston amendment adopted by the U.S. Senate suggesting a supplement to the Mutual Security Act, according to which countries expropriating American properties without adequate compensation may no longer receive foreign aid.

"There is a genuine need for effective protection of private foreign investments, not only as far as private investors interested in such investments are concerned, but also governments of the capital investing countries. This applies mainly to the German economy, which, in view of considerable foreign losses suffered in the past, has been very reluctant in the field of capital export. The Federal budget law also protects the interests of all citizens as it provides that tax money may not be spent for such countries which are not willing to protect rights and interests of foreigners against unlawful encroachments.

"The Cologne society is convinced that these provisions of the Federal budget law constitute an initial effective contribution to stem the lately growing tendency to violate private foreign rights. This most surely will also allow a considerable increase of Germany's share in development aid, with available means to go to such capital needy countries which abide by the rules of international law. The society hopes that in the interest of the capital investors—as well as the capital receiving countries—this initial step will pave the way for the conclusion of a broad multilateral protection convention which should be joined by as many countries as possible."

A. ROBERT SMITH, OF EUGENE REGISTER-GUARD, SURVEYS CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE ON NORTH CARCLINA SEACOAST

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a number of bills before the Senate would authorize establishment of the Oregon Dunes national seashore and other magnificent shoreline parks under jurisdiction of our U.S. National Park Service. I am pleased and proud to have my name associated with all these pieces of beneficial and forward-looking legislation.

It is the history of national parks that local opposition frequently exists at the time of their original authorization. This has occurred at Grand Canyon, Yosemite, Mount Rainier, Crater Lake, Shenandoah, and at many other great parks throughout the Nation. The proposed Oregon Dunes and Sea Lion Caves national seashore is no exception to this prevalent rule. Particularly in the vicinity of Florence, hostility has existed among some people to the idea of a national seashore park.

An enterprising daily newspaper in Lane County, where much of the seashore is located, the Eugene Register-Guard, decided to inquire into the basis of this opposition. Was it justified? The Guard and its editors turned their attention to the most appropriate example which was available to them—the Cape Hatteras national seashore on the North Carolina coast. Antagonism to this national seashore existed in the beginning, too. Yet 6 years ago the Cape Hatteras area park finally was established.

The Register-Guard detailed its able Washington, D.C., correspondent, Mr. A. Robert Smith, to make an on-the-scene study of Cape Hatteras. I think this is journalism at its best—to undertake a factual study which seeks to get behind the explosive words, the prejudicial phrases, the political catchalls, the superficial slogans and the half truths.

Would a national seashore recreation area be a good or bad thing for the lovely Oregon seacoast with its grandeur? How better to find out than to dispatch a trained newspaper reporter like A. Robert Smith to analyze and inquire into its counterpart across the continent on the Atlantic coast—namely Cape Hatteras? The Eugene Register-Guard has performed a valuable service for its readers in assuming the expense and effort of this comprehensive survey.

As a result of his extensive journey to the area of Cape Hatteras, Mr. Smith prepared four detailed articles for the Register-Guard. These were published on July 26, 1959, and for 3 successive days thereafter. I have profited by reading them and I have learned a great deal. I am certain that other readers of the Register-Guard will share this opinion.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have these informative articles printed in the body of the RECORD. They support thoroughly, as I see it, the case for an Oregon Dunes national seashore. They review the early opposition to Cape Hatteras. They show the emotional intensity of this antagonism. But they also show how land values have risen due to the park, how the general economy of the region has soared to new high levels.

Opponents of Oregon Dunes complain that the national seashore will take property off the tax rolls. Opponents of Cape Hatteras voiced the same complaint. Yet A. Robert Smith quotes a leading banker in the Cape Hatteras area as pointing out that, while some property was removed from the tax rolls to comprise the park, land remaining on the tax rolls often increased in value 50 to 100 times as the park intensified and heightened the general economic activity of the region.

Furthermore, it is of crucial significance that, in the 6 years the Cape Hatteras national seashore has been in operation, visitors have soared from 100,000 in number to 348,000—an increase of over 300 percent. Business from tourist trade has risen 150 to 200 percent, according to Mr. Smith's article. This would seem to answer the arguments of seashore area development opponents that inclusion of the Oregon Dunes in the national park system would affect business adversely.

In my opinion, one of the major benefits from the series of articles from the Oregon newspaper is the emphasis that has been given to the different status of seashore recreation areas, as compared with national parks. National parks are primarily for preservation of some exceptional and unique scenic beauty, with

recreational activities there in a secondary category. The seashore recreation areas, on the other hand, underscore outdoor recreation activities such as swimming, fishing, sailing, boating, and waterfowl hunting, just as their name implies. The two types of development cannot be safely compared because of different basic functions.

I was very much interested in the portion of Mr. Smith's article which dealt with establishment of boundaries of Cape Hatteras. There has been much discussion in Oregon regarding what portions of the terrain should be included and what areas excluded from the recreation area. I thought it noteworthy in the Cape Hatteras development that, as Mr. Smith said:

Park Service officials held meetings in each village, drew up maps, and reached agreements with local citizens on where the most suitable boundary markers should be placed.

Thus we have ample evidence that local citizens will not be forced to unquestioningly accept any bureaucratic edicts, but that Park Service personnel devote much time to working out acceptable seashore area boundaries.

Cape Hatteras national seashore recreation area is the first and only park development of its kind within the United States. It provides a precedent and case history for similar use of shoreline elsewhere in the Nation. I think that anyone concerned with the problem of meeting our national recreation requirements, of the present and the future, will be impressed by what has been accomplished at Cape Hatteras in a comparatively short time, as related by Mr. A. Robert Smith's articles. They provide an excellent basis for judging the value of an expanded and accelerated program of shoreline recreation area development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Register-Guard, July 26, 1959]

BEAUTY OF CAROLINA'S SHORE DRAWS PEOPLE FROM AFAR—I

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—What's in a national seashore besides a name? How are they developed by the National Park Service? How would seashore creation affect the tourist industry—the people who live nearby? To answer these and other questions, raised by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER'S proposal for an Oregon Dunes national seashore, the Eugene Register-Guard sent its Washington correspondent, and photographer, Phil Wolcott, to Cape Hatteras, N.C. Below is the first of four articles telling what they found along the Nation's first—and only—national seashore recreation area.)

(By A. Robert Smith)

NAGS HEAD, N.C.—If you want to find out what happens when the Federal Government establishes a national seashore, as is now being proposed for the Oregon Dunes coastal area, this is the place to go to get the answer.

For here is the Cape Hatteras national seashore recreation area, the only one of its kind in the country. However it is only the first of a number of such areas that the National Park Service wants to create in the future in Oregon, Texas, Massachusetts, and Indiana.

This seashore is really a string of low, sandy islands lying off the North Carolina coast, familiarly and historically known as the Outer Banks. The national seashore recreation area starts just below the vacation mecca of Nags Head. It embraces some 80 miles of uninterrupted beaches, as well as inland marshes where wildlife is protected and fed.

"We feel," said Robert F. Gibbs, superintendent of the area, "that the beach itself is the recreation area, and our business is to preserve it in a natural state and not allow it to become cluttered up with casinos that you find in commercial beach areas."

The area is in essentially the same natural state that Sir Walter Raleigh's "lost colonists" found here 375 years ago. This policy for managing and developing Cape Hatteras was outlined in the act of Congress authorizing it, as follows:

"Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, particularly swimming, boating, sailing, fishing and other recreational activities of similar nature, which shall be developed for such uses as needed, the said area shall be permanently reserved as primitive wilderness and no development of the project or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna of the physiographic conditions now prevailing in this area."

One original exception to this edict in the act was to allow residents, or "bankers," as they are called, to continue commercial fishing, which historically had been the chief means of livelihood for many inhabitants of the villages on the outer banks.

Three years after the authorizing act was passed, an amendment was enacted to permit another exception to this policy—hunting, in season, for ducks and geese was permitted. Hunting is not allowed in the national parks. With this concession came a change in the name: instead of just calling it a national seashore, the words "recreation area" were tacked on.

ONLY OTHER CONCESSION

Apparently the only other concession to the march of civilization is that extraction of sand for commercial use has been permitted under specified conditions.

From the window of his headquarters office, Superintendent Gibbs can watch bathers a half mile down the beach as they flock to the Coquina Beach bathing facility developed by the park service under its Mission 66 park improvement program.

"When I see the commercial beaches up around Nags Head, with 'kids' walking around with beer cans, and then look at our public beach, where families have wholesome recreational facilities, it gives me a great deal of pride," Gibbs observed.

An eye-catching feature of this beach facility is an imaginative shade structure, built of tiers of laminated wood, so designed to withstand hurricane winds up to 200 miles per hour. Under it are picnic tables on a wooden platform, dressing rooms, drinking water, toilets, and an information center from which park rangers lead nature walks along the beach twice daily. No concessions—not even a soft-drink machine—are made toward commercialization.

This is the mood of a national seashore—improved along creative, functional lines to facilitate use of what nature created, but resisting commercialization to the last.

NO COMPETITION

Parkland is off limits to commercialization. The result is that in the towns outside the national seashore boundaries, and in eight villages that lie in private property islands within the national seashore, local merchants, restaurant operators, motel keepers, and filling station managers meet the needs of the visitor without competition—which some feared originally—from any government enterprises.

Under a lease arrangement, a boat marina which was operating in prepark days at Oregon Inlet (named for a ship which was first to sail through the inlet) continues to operate, offering deep sea fishing boats for adventurous anglers who have already this year caught about 100 Blue Marlin off the Hatteras coast.

Gibbs said the park service would be willing to let private enterprise build two more fishing piers at appropriate places where visitors could drop a line to take advantage of the splendid sport fishing. Jeeps, available for rent in the villages, may be used to travel up and down the seashore by surf fishermen or just plain joyriders.

LOTS OF CUSTOMERS

Several camp grounds have been established. These are equipped with showers, toilets, and drinking water. Trailers and tents dotted these areas 2 weeks ago, despite the rainy aftermath of hurricane Cindy and a waterspout which blew through a bowling alley in Nags Head.

The citizens from the crowded metropolis can, of course, pick out any spot along the 80-mile length to splash in the surf, lie in the sun, or build sand castles, quite possibly with no one in sight in either direction on the sandy wastes that stretch to the far horizons.

Why do people drive hundreds of miles to Cape Hatteras seashore?

"Well," said Gibbs, "these people from the prairie country (many inland State license tags are in evidence) come because it's just different from anything they have at home. There is something intriguing about the seashore. It brings out a sense of adventure. You never know what the next wave will wash up—a bottle or a piece of an old ship."

BOOK ABOUT SHIPWRECKS

A local author has published a book of the countless shipwrecks off Cape Hatteras, "Graveyard of the Atlantic," and the park service operates a museum of the sea which portrays the lore of seafaring before radar and other electronic devices brought relative safety to ocean commerce.

During the days of sailing ships, the Coast Guard maintained numerous stations along these islands. One of the lighthouses, a tall beauty built in 1870 is open to all who can endure its 255-step spiral staircase to the windswept catwalk aloft.

Although often not noticed by the casual visitor, perhaps the most important single improvement by the Government is in stabilizing the beach. Fences have been built and sea grass planted to halt sand erosion. About a hundred feet from the ocean a barrier ridge has been built by letting sand pile up around fences. The barrier guards the highway from being covered with sands that shift with every wind that huffs in from the Atlantic.

Without this stabilization program, to which $100,000 was allocated in 1957, the land formation would be in constant jeopardy.

On the west lies Pamlico Sound, between the seashore and the mainland. One bridge now connects the island chain with the mainland, but a second bridge is being planned by the State.

There are few trees the entire length of this area, and virtually all the vegetation has a gone-with-the-wind appearance. It seems to be a case of survival of the toughest plants.

Within the seashore recreation area is located the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge, a 5,880-acre tract where 34 species of migratory and nonmigratory waterfowl have been noted. However Cape Hatteras is better known for its fishing. Channel bass, bluefish, sea mullet, trout, spot, croaker,

dolphin, amberjack, mackerel, marlin, and sailfish are caught here.

The Park Service charges no admission fee to enter the seashore area or for use of any of the facilities.

DRAWING POWER GROWS

The drawing power of these attractions appears to be growing. In the 6 years since Cape Hatteras national seashore was created, visitor attendance has increased from an estimated 100,000 a year to 348,335 last year. The visitors who come from far and wide seem to love it, many to return again and again.

But there was no love for this establishment on the part of some local citizens who did their best to stop it.

[From the Register-Guard, July 27, 1959]

NATIONAL SEASHORE DEVELOPMENT: HATTERAS PROJECT ALMOST BLOCKED—II

(By A. Robert Smith)

CAPE HATTERAS, N.C.—Creation of the country's first national seashore recreation area here at Cape Hatteras came the hard way, against some bitter local opposition, and over financial obstacles that nearly blocked it.

Over a quarter century elapsed between the birth of the concept of preserving this seacoast as a public playground and its final realization. But it was not, as some might imagine, a case of someone in Washington trying to put across an idea that was unpopular in the Carolina grassroots.

Quite the contrary, most of the steam behind the Cape Hatteras seashore movement came from local people—editors, legislators, the Governor, and private citizens.

The man who is credited with first advocating preservation of this area was a newspaper editor, W. O. Saunders, of Elizabeth City, N.C. In 1922, he proposed making the entire coast of North Carolina into one big long State park.

A few years later, this district sent to Washington a new Congressman, Lindsay C. Warren, who took up the cause. Successful in first getting a national historical monument to commemorate the first airplane flight of the Wright Brothers at Kitty Hawk just a few miles up the coast from here, Warren set out to get a national park to preserve the Outer Banks.

SEASHORE BILL BEGINS TO MOVE

Then came the real estate boom of the roaring twenties, bringing a number of New Jersey land speculators into the area, buying up miles of isolated, sparsely inhabited land for a few dollars an acre. The land was worth so little that in those days is wasn't even carried on the county tax rolls, one veteran observer recalls. There is little or no farming or livestock raising to give the land any agricultural value.

Came the depression, and Warren's bill for a Cape Hatteras national seashore began to move. It was finally enacted into law in 1937.

"Nobody objected to the bill," recalled Victor Meekins, editor the Coastland Times, the weekly newspaper at Manteo, county seat of Dare County. "They welcomed anything during the depression."

Meekins had worked under Saunders at Elizabeth City, and, after establishing his own paper here in 1935, he became a crusader for making the dream come true.

There was one critical weakness in the act authorizing the Cape Hatteras national seashore: It didn't authorize the Government to spend any money to create it. Little of this area was Federal property, which meant the Government had to depend on donations of money or land if a park was ever to be established. The only sizable public land was Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge, but this 5,880-acre tract was not along the ocean. "There were no givers at first," recalled Meekins.

DONATION FORMS PARK CENTER

The National Park Service, its hopes high that some philanthropic souls would come forward, made use of WPA and CCC workers in 1938–39 to begin a dune stabilization program. Some 2,500 young men were put to work in this fight against sand erosion, which had become so bad that it threatened the very existence of these flat sandy islands composing the Outer Banks.

The first big break came when the heirs of Henry Phipps, reputed to own more coastal property than anyone else in the country, gave 2,700 acres, which included the heart of the desired area, Cape Hatteras itself. This formed the nucleus of the park which was to come.

So in 1950 the Governor reactivated the State seashore commission. But the amount of land donated thus far fell far short of the 10,000 acres minimum required by the Interior Department for creation of a national seashore. It began to look like the dream wouldn't come true.

At this point, an influential resident, Huntingdon Cairns, general counsel and secretary of the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., put the bug in the ear of a key official of the Mellon philanthropic enterprises. Consequently the children of Andrew W. Mellon, each from his own foundation, donated funds which the State agreed to match—making a land acquisition kitty of $1.6 million.

This put the movement in business in 1951 for the first time. It also aroused opponents to arms for the first time. The outcome of the struggle modified the resulting national seashore in some significant respects.

[From the Register-Guard, July 28, 1959]

STATE'S HIGHWAY PLAN BASIS OF HATTERAS OPPOSITION—SIZE OF AREA HALVED IN WAKE OF PROTEST—III

(By A. Robert Smith)

HATTERAS VILLAGE, N.C.—"Those who opposed the park said it looked like a big black snake was going to gobble them up."

This was the recollection of Robert E. Jordan, manager of "The Lost Colony" theatrical production on Roanoke Island. The black snake was the asphalt highway that the State proposed to build down the outer banks to make Cape Hatteras national seashore possible.

Local opponents had no more outspoken or effective, fighter than Andrew Austin, who admits he didn't want the new road or the park. A white-thatched man in his eighties, Austin operates a general store here.

You might sum up Austin's case against the seashore fairly by saying he simply liked it better the way it was before the visionaries went to work.

In those days there was no highway into Hatteras village, and Austin had become pretty skilled at piloting his model T up the coastal sands just out of reach of the pounding surf.

Austin also owns land. He sold some 740 acres of it, located just below here, many years ago to a multimillionaire, George Albert Lyons, for a hunting club that was somewhat on the exclusive side. It had five members. They came here for the duck hunting, which in those days several decades ago was splendidly unhampered by bag limits. The oldtimers say a man could bring down 100 ducks or geese in an hour.

"We had a good class of people coming here then," argued Austin, claiming credit for starting the area on its way to becoming a hunting and fishing area for men of means.

GROUP HOLDS PROTEST MEETINGS

Another friend of Austin's is W. A. Worth, an aged Elizabeth City lawyer, whose land fight with the Government was on everyone's lips. These men were the most influential opponents.

"We had a petition with 85 percent of the people here in Hatteras against the park," Austin recalled. "And Lindsay Warren said it would never be done if the people opposed it. Then I took all the means I had—I even sold some of my stock—and built a motor court. The next year the State started taking our land. So, of course, we fought it."

They held public protest meetings, circulated petitions, sent delegations to Washington to try to upset the plans of the Interior Department and the State for implementing their plan to convert land donated or financed by private sources into a huge seashore park.

But the proponents of the park held most of the trump cards. They already had a law on the books authorizing the national seashore, and by 1952 gifts from the Mellon family and the State had made land buying possible for the first time. The only thing the opposition could hope to do was arouse local inhabitants.

Victor Meekins, the local country editor who is known for his blunt language in print and in person, sized up the opposition this way: "Two or three very greedy real estate men started a campaign against it. You can always get the natives worked up by saying 'You won't be able to hunt like you used to.'"

Meekins claimed the opponents sent a "rum hound" up and down the beach, telling the inhabitants of the fearful things the Federal Government was going to thrust down their throats if this thing went through.

The editor said Austin opposed State construction of a road into Hatteras out of self-interest; he operated a freight boat to and from Elizabeth City to supply the town merchants with their goods. A road would allow trucks to bring it in.

LAND VALUES ARE DISPUTED

The story most often related to the inquiring visitor is that of Worth, the Elizabeth City attorney who made a fortune in one transaction, and which rubbed many citizens hereabouts the wrong way. It involves a 2,200-acre tract of land north of Oregon Inlet, which had been owned by a wealthy New Yorker who had decided to give it to the State for a park. He had been one of a group who had reportedly paid $60,000 for the property to form a hunting club. But he died before he could make the gift. His heirs got tangled up in their inheritance, and the outcome was that the land was acquired by Worth, who had done legal work for them. The price he paid was $6,000, according to the county recorder of deeds—or less than $3 per acre.

Worth's close friend, Austin, said Worth built a boat marina for sport fishermen at Oregon Inlet, and proceeded to mark off lots for sale before the park service came in with offers to buy the land. The Government offered Worth $192,000 for this property, and deposited the money to await his acceptance. He rejected the offered, claiming his land was now worth over $1 million.

The Government moved to condemn and threw the case into court, where it is still unsettled, after several new settlement figures ranging around $400,000 have been mentioned.

The probable cost of acquiring this property was so unexpectedly high that the two Mellon-financed foundations. Old Dominion and Avalon, had to kick in some more money.

There are two local points of view on this case.

"When a man buys some land and the value goes up, that's just his good luck," declared Austin.

"It's robbery," declared Meekins. "It's a crime against the public."

In any event, the opposition made some headway and won some concessions, even if it lost the ultimate struggle against the national seashore.

PARK AREA REDUCED IN SIZE

For one thing, the size of the area included in the park was trimmed considerably. The original bill, passed in 1937, would have authorized a national seashore 62,000 acres in size. But by 1953, many homes had been built along the northern stretch of the outer banks in the towns of Nags Head, Kill Devil Hill, and Kitty Hawk.

When financing the purchase of uninhabited land presented a problem, it became evident that purchase of more expensive residential property would run the cost well beyond the donations. Hence, the final size is now less than half—28,500 acres—the original seashore proposal.

A concession to the opposition also whittled off some acreage around each of the eight tiny villages which were founded originally around Coast Guard stations in the days of sailing ships. Although some of these villages were dying out fast (the 1950 population of Hatteras, the largest, was 480, and of Salvo, the smallest, 68), the Park Service drew back its orginal boundaries away from these towns to give them growing room.

Now as you drive down the highway, you know you are coming to a town when commercial signboards begin to appear along the road, located on property outside the jurisdiction of the Park Service.

Austin claims the Park Service, under its original plan, would have taken his motel, part of the town hotel, and several private homes. As it turned out, his motel remains intact, but he says he will have to move an old Coast Guard building which he converted into apartments.

In fact, the outcome was that not one private residence along this 80-mile coast was taken over by the Park Service when the final boundaries were established. Park Service officials held meetings in each village, drew up maps and reached agreement with local citizens on where the most suitable boundary markers should be placed.

Thus ended the long struggle, except for some holdout land cases still tied up in Federal court, where a crowded docket and a sick judge have delayed final settlement.

[From the Register-Guard, July 29, 1959]

BANK DEPOSITS, LAND VALUES RISE AS AREA'S TOURIST BUSINESS BOOMS—IV

(By A. Robert Smith)

MANTEO, N.C.—"I don't think there is anyone who is opposed to it. I think they are satisfied."

So said Andrew Austin, the most outspoken critics of creating Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area, 7 years after losing his fight against it.

The economy of his town of Hatteras is much better now, but he claimed it's not a bit due to the new park.

"I don't think it's helped anyone," Austin declared, claiming the county tourist bureau does a god job of promoting the historical and recreational attractions of the cape. Easy money accounts for the prosperity, he argued.

How did he account for the great rise in tourist visitations?

"The road," he answered. "When the road came in, by Jerry they just piled in. There's no doubt that this area is going to have a boom. But it's not because of the park. It's because of the fishing grounds."

Here at the county seat, editor Victor Meekins snorted at Austin's argument against the significance of the national seashore.

"This is a great economic asset," he asserted. "It means millions of dollars to us. Our main industry before was fishing, but it has been destroyed by wasteful methods. The roads that are bringing tourists into this area wouldn't have been built if it hadn't been for the national seashore. There was nothing to bring the roads for—a population of less than 5,000 along a 130-mile coast wouldn't justify a road. The State took a long shot in building this road."

Access to this area was made possible not only by a road, but by ferries across several inlets and sounds where bridges are now scheduled for construction. The Federal Government supplied surplus amphibious landing ships for the ferryboats, and the State operates them free of tolls. Visitors sometimes wait their turn in line for the ferry for hours, or turn back in impatience. Bridges, it is expected, will result in many more tourists.

Down at the Bank of Manteo, Manager Maynard Mangum pulled out his ledgers and found that bank deposits remained fairly constant from 1944 to 1950, but then began to increase substantially. Deposits of $935,000 on December 30, 1950, rose to $1,861,000 on December 31, 1958. The day I sat in his office they were up to $2,166,000.

W. R. Pearce, another banker, gave a personal indicator of what has happened here. He said he bought several seashore lots in 1937 for $300 each, and he has recently refused $5,000 for them.

"A lot of people feared it would take land off the tax rolls," Pearce recalled, "but they didn't realize the land that remained on the tax rolls would increase in value 50 to 100 times."

"The fishing business is gone," he added. "If it hadn't been for the park, I don't know what we would have done."

At the Dare County courthouse, the supervisor of taxes hauled out his books to reveal what has happened to the total assessed valuation of lands in the county during this period when private land was going off the tax rolls into Federal ownership. His books showed that in 1950, before the park was created, the total assessed valuation was $11,156,752. By 1957, it had climbed to $18,520,913. Last year, after a revaluation of beach property just north of the national seashore, the total jumped to $25,130,457—and local taxpayers enjoyed a tax cut from $1 to 80 cents per hundred.

Melvin Daniels, registrar of deeds for the county, said that during the same time the population has not increased much. There are now 6,000 to 7,000 in the county compared to 5,000 a few decades ago.

Aycock Brown, manager of the county tourist bureau for 7 years, disputes Austin's contention that the national seashore has not brought more tourists than otherwise would have responded to his publicity efforts for this area.

"A national seashore gets much wider publicity than we can give the area," Brown said, paying tribute to the Park Service. "It's the most wonderful thing in the world."

He said tourist business is up 150 to 200 percent. An ex-newspaperman, Brown expressed a point of view quite the opposite of Austin's yearning of the old days of exclusive gun clubs.

"Now all the people can enjoy the seashore," Brown observed. "The day of the wealthy family owning these areas is over."

The postmaster at Nags Head supplied another indicator of growth in the local economy. In the past 11 years, he said stamp sales have risen from $1,700 to $9,000. This is one price index which hasn't been subject to inflation, since postal rates have changed very little in that time.

The story of Archie Burrus tells about economic expansion here in human terms. Returning to Manteo after serving in the Armed Forces during World War II, Burrus went into the grocery business with his father. They operated a small self-service grocery store.

When the park was created Burrus decided to gamble on a big motel near the entrance.

"People thought I was crazy for building with brick," he recalled. "They thought I wouldn't get my money out of it because of the seasonal nature of business. But today everyone builds with brick." The older places are wood frame and cedar shingle construction.

Burrus got his money out, all right. This season he added a swimming pool, and the fanciest restaurant in these parts, reportedly at a cost of $100,000.

No studies have been made in this area to determine the dollar impact of tourist trade, but in addition to tourist dollars there is a Park Service payroll which amounted to $220,000 last fiscal year, making it "by far the biggest payroll in the county," said Robert F. Gibbs, superintendent of the national seashore. This does not cover wages paid by contractors who are doing work on improvement and maintenance in the seashore recreation area, he noted.

The Park Service employs 75 at maximum strength, about 16 of which are seasonal employees—naturalists and rangers, a number of whom are public schoolteachers who work in the park during the summer teaching visitors about the seashore.

Thus far, the Park Service has spent $3,741,434 (not counting the cost of buying the land) in developing Cape Hatteras. Just over $1 million has gone into roads and trails, another million into buildings and utilities, nearly a half million into dune stabilization and the balance in operation and maintenance.

Under Mission 66, the park improvement program, over $6 million has been programed for Cape Hatteras improvements.

All these expenditures flow through local economic channels. And they are designed to bring the national seashore up to the expectations and demands at a steadily increasing number of tourists.

Visitation in the last 6 years has increased from less than 100,000 to 348,335 persons annually—and it is expected that, within the next 10 years, well over 1 million tourists annually will visit the Hatteras seashore, Gibbs said.

JOHN A. BURNS—FIRST STATE ELECTIONS IN HAWAII

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] made a most statesmanlike address in this body on the first State election ever to be held in Hawaii. In particular, the Senator from Alaska paid tribute to the Honorable JOHN A. BURNS, the able Delegate from Hawaii. Mr. President, I would like to call this statesmanlike address to the attention of each Member of this body. It is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, August 3, beginning on page 14976.

At the same time, I want to associate myself as strongly as possible with the position and views of the Senator from Alaska, both with respect to the elections in Hawaii, and most particularly with respect to the contributions of Delegate BURNS. I believe, Mr. President, that I am in a better position than any other Member of this body to evaluate the character, ability, and the contributions of JACK BURNS to his State and to the Nation.

I was chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in those trying days in the last Congress when the fate of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii hung in the balance. The situation was such, Mr. President, that had Mr. BURNS been a man of different character, a man of lesser courage or more limited political vision, it is extremely

doubtful whether either Alaska or Hawaii would have attained statehood at this time, or, probably, for some time to come.

As I wrote Mr. BURNS after his selection by the Democratic Party of Hawaii to be its standard bearer:

Statehood for Hawaii is a monument, in no small part, to your judgment, your sensibility to men and situations, and, above all, to your own character and personality which won the deep respect of official Washington. What may not be so well recognized is your truly great administrative and executive ability.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter I wrote Mr. BURNS under date of July 17, 1959, and a brief press release making it public, appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, because of my knowledge of Mr. BURNS' high character and great ability, I wish to express my most earnest hope that a way speedily will be found through which his services can continue to the State he had such a monumental part in creating and to our Nation.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to say a word about the first State elections held in Hawaii, which took place on Tuesday, July 28.

As the distinguished Senator from Alaska stated, these elections resulted in the selection to the Congress of an American of Anglo-Saxon ancestry, one of Chinese ancestry, and one of Japanese ancestry. Over the years we were considering Hawaii statehood, I have stated publicly, on several occasions, that I would be honored to sit in the Senate of the United States beside a fellow-American of Japanese or Chinese ancestry whose attainments and gifts of character had qualified him, in the opinion of his fellow citizens, for the high office of Senator.

Last Tuesday's elections now have made the vision of mine a reality, and I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. President, to welcome to this body the Honorable OREN E. LONG, former Governor of Hawaii, and the Honorable HIRAM FONG, former senator of the Territory of Hawaii. I also hail the election to the other body of DANIEL INOUYE, an American of Japanese ancestry whose devotion to the ideals and principles of America has been written in his own blood on our country's battlefields.

Mr. President, Tuesday's elections in Hawaii are another milestone in American history, and in the advancement of the historic American principles of equality, democracy and freedom.

The press release presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

BURNS BEST QUALIFIED TO LEAD NEW STATE OF HAWAII, CHAIRMAN OF SENATE STATEHOOD UNIT FINDS—SENATOR MURRAY, OF INTERIOR COMMITTEE, HAILS DELEGATE'S PROVEN EXECUTIVE ABILITY—PLEDGES CONTINUED COOPERATION

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY (Democrat, Montana), chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the committee which earlier this year handled the legislation admitting Hawaii as the 50th State, today made public the text of a letter he had written Hawaiian Delegate JOHN A. BURNS. Mr. BURNS is the Democratic candidate for Governor of Hawaii, opposing William Quinn, who is Hawaii's present Territorial Governor. Senator MURRAY had previously called on President Eisenhower to remove Mr. Quinn from office because, as a Federal employee seeking elective office, the Eisenhower appointee was violating the Hatch Act.

The text of Senator MURRAY's letter is as follows:

JULY 17, 1959.

Hon. JOHN A. BURNS,
Honolulu, T.H.

DEAR JACK: I am of course delighted at the results of the primary in Hawaii which have given my fellow citizens of my sister State such outstanding candidates for office as yourself, Oren Long, Frank Fasi, and Dan Inouye.

The selection of all of you justifies fully my long-standing and vigorously maintained faith in Hawaii's political maturity and complete readiness for Statehood.

Because of our work together for statehood, as well as for so many interim measures for the good of the Territory, your relationship and mine has been and is a particularly personal and close one. In my long years in public life—in a few days I will mark my 25th anniversary of service in the Senate—I have seen many candidates come and go. I can state without equivocation that you are one of the best qualified, by reason of character, ability, and experience of all of those many aspirants for office that I have known over the many years.

I am certain the people of Hawaii know of the great, the essential, part you had in bringing about statehood so early in this session of Congress. Statehood for Hawaii is a monument, in no small part, to your judgment, your sensitivity to men and situations, and, above all, to your own character and personality which won the deep respect of official Washington. What may not be so well recognized is your truly great administrative and executive ability. I have seen you in action when the going was tough, if I may use the phrase, and I know that you have what it takes to make a truly great first Governor of a truly great State.

In that office you will have to meet many very complicated, serious problems, some of which will involve the help of the Congress, at least in their initial stages. I want to assure you of the continued cooperation, full and complete, of this committee, and I am convinced, of the majority party in both Houses of Congress in the difficult and trying days of transition from Territorial status to statehood.

My best and warmest wishes to you and the people of Hawaii for your success.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

UNION ACTIVITY ABROAD OFFERS LITTLE LIKELIHOOD OF RELIEF FOR AMERICAN INDUSTRY FROM LOW FOREIGN WAGE COMPETITION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, with every day that passes I become more deeply concerned with the increasingly grave problem facing domestic American industry from surging foreign competition. Recently our International Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on my resolution calling for an investigation of the investment of American private capital abroad. I was struck during these hearings with the unwillingness of some of the ablest and wisest experts in foreign trade and investment to recognize the extent and seriousness of this problem.

One of the hopeful assertions by some of the experts has been that foreign countries—as their productivity increases will rapidly increase wages until wages in competitive countries are far closer to ours. How feeble a hope this may be is set forth in persuasive detail in an article in this morning's Wall Street Journal that describes the nature of the European labor union. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNUSUAL UNIONS: EUROPE'S LABOR GROUPS STRESS POLITICS, LEAN LESS ON PAY BARGAINING—A LOOK AT AUTO FIRMS SHOWS WHY WAGES ARE LIKELY TO STAY BELOW U.S. LEVELS—FIAT IS "LIKE A FATHER"

(By Dan Cordtz)

TURIN, ITALY.—"Collective bargaining? In the Italian auto industry, there isn't any. Fiat just gives everything to the workers—like a father."

This bitter comment comes from Secondo Perroni, secretary of the Italian Metalworkers Federation. His union is one of the three major labor organizations which represent workers of Fiat Co., builder of 90 percent of Italy's motor vehicles.

Although the situation he describes is not in every respect typical of Europe's bustling auto plants, it points up a fact of significance to American car manufacturers and other U.S. producers who already are feeling the pressure of lower foreign wage rates.

For there is not, in Europe's auto plants or in most other European industries, anything resembling the tough, two-sided collective bargaining between the United Auto Workers and the Big Three of the U.S. auto industry. As a result, Europe's lower wage rates, a management talking point in the current steel talks in the United States are not likely to be eliminated as a big competitive factor in the near future.

THE UPPER HAND

There are, of course, considerable differences of detail in the labor situations in various countries. In some, organized labor's influence in politics and even on wages at the national level is pronounced. But a look at the European auto industry shows why, it is generally true that management—to a degree long since forgotten in the United States—holds the upper hand in dealing with its workers.

Even in France's government-owned Regie Nationale des Usines Renault, generally regarded as Europe's most liberal automotive employer, a top labor relations executive states frankly, "We decide what wages we are going to pay and then tell the unions."

One result of this situation, as American car makers know only too well, is a general wage level far below that of the United States. A typical Fiat worker, for example, earns less than $100 a month. His American counterpart gets as much in a week. In England, employees of Vauxhall Motors, Ltd., General Motors Corp's. subsidiary, average about $175. And workers generally put in more than the American's 40 hours a week.

NO NARROWING OF THE GAP

"Our wages are going to continue to rise," says Dr. Heinz Nordhoff, president of Volkswagen, "but yours are going up about as fast. I don't foresee any narrowing of the wage gap very soon."

Since 1950, average hourly wages in U.S. auto plants have risen 53 percent—a rate exceeded in Europe only by Germany's approximately 80 percent. But Germany, of

course, started from a depressed base. In Italy, at the other extreme auto wages have gone up only 36 percent in the same interval.

Why, in countries where the union movement predates that of the United States has labor been so ineffective in boosting wages in such an efficient and prosperous industry as automobiles? There seem to be four principal reasons:

The structure of the unions themselves; the form which collective bargaining usually takes; the concept of a union's function and proper means of action; and, finally, the basic attitude of most workers.

To begin with, there is no counterpart of the UAW in any of Europe's auto-producing nations. Auto workers are represented either by a multiplicity of craft-oriented unions (as in England, where 22 unions are recognized in the Dagenham plant of Ford Motor Co., Ltd.) or, more frequently, by huge, all-inclusive labor organizations whose membership takes in all metal-working industries.

WE ARE HOSTILE

"We are hostile to the idea of a separate auto union," explains George Delamarre, secretary general of the French Metalworkers Federation, "because of the possibility in an economic emergency of losing the mobility of labor if we create special organizations for separate industry segments."

Mr. Delamarre admits, however, that this determination to maintain unions with broad membership probably holds back gains in the auto industry—where a separate union could concentrate on winning special concessions impossible for other industries to grant.

In practice, however, when wage negotiations are held they are usually conducted by large associations of employers and either huge union federations (such as Britain's Trades Union Congress) or a group of unions. British auto manufacturers, with the exception of Ford and Vauxhall, are represented by the Engineering and Allied Employers National Federation in bargaining with the Trades Union Congress. Some 4,400 companies are members of the federation, and their total employment amounts to nearly 2.5 million. In Sweden, basic bargaining on all wages is between the Lands Organization—which represents nearly every wage earner in the country—and the Swedish Employers Federation. A really national wage increase (last year it was 2 percent) is determined at this level and industry-wise unions and employer groups can engage in supplementary bargaining only within that framework.

"When it gets down to the level of our own company," says Dr. P. A. Norkrans, director of personnel of A. B. Volvo of Sweden, "there isn't very much left to talk about."

Some companies do not participate in association bargaining. But with the wage pattern for great numbers of workers determined by the national or industrywise agreements, their own action usually is conditioned by what has been won in the other plants.

The broad agreements, moreover, are usually written with the interests of the association's smallest, least-efficient producers in mind. In such cases, once the unions have settled for relatively little, nearly all pressure is removed from nonmember firms to do better.

Complains Charles Levinson, secretary of the automotive division of the International Metalworkers Federation in Geneva: "We are prepared to accept national bargaining on minimum wages and working hours. But this must be completed at the company level in terms of actual wages, fringe benefits, working conditions and grievance procedures." Up to now, except in a few instances, this has not been done.

Where companies do improve on the minimums, their actions are nearly always the result of corporate policy—not union pressure. Thus Fiat pays 80 percent higher wage rates than required under the national contract for the metalworking industry—but, as Mr. Perroni says, it grants such improvements like a father. Similarly Renault, whose own contract is so much more liberal than that of the rest of the French metalworking industry that it has drawn heated criticism from other employers, hardly was responding to labor muscle when it wrote its terms.

DOING WHAT FORD DID

"We're just doing what Henry Ford did 50 years ago," says Managing Director Pierre Dreyfus. "We can't sell cars unless people have money, and they can't have money if we pay miserable wages."

Adds Didier Limon, Renault's assistant personnel director: "We'd actually like to see the unions stronger than they are—it would make things tougher for the Communists if the unions were effective in bargaining. But at the moment, the strength of unions is not in their numbers but in their political connections."

Such political affiliations are the essence of European unionism. The union, in most instances, is first and foremost the plant-level extensions of a given political party. Even in Sweden, where the Lands Organization is far more all-encompassing than the AFL–CIO in the United States, a portion of every member's dues money goes into the coffers of the ruling Social Democratic Party.

This identification between union and political goals had a twofold result: Members are more likely to look to the government—rather than collective bargaining—for their objectives. And whatever objectives are sought, they are likely to apply to all workers, not just those in a particularly favored industry.

A FETISH FOR POLITICAL SOLUTIONS

"European unions," charges Victor Reuther, head of the UAW's internation department "have made a fetish of seeking political solutions to what are essentially economic problems." The solutions usually have been vast new schemes of social benefits for all workers, rather than higher wages in industries which could afford them. And, Mr. Levinson asserts, "this is fine if you're sick or unemployed, but it doesn't make buyers for automobiles."

State-furnished social benefits in Italy, for example, are estimated by Fiat officials to increase the average worker's income by 40 percent—with company-provided fringe benefits boosting it still more.

The political obsession mentioned by Mr. Reuther accounts for another bargaining weakness of Europe's unions—their concept of the strike as a protest directed toward the government rather than a means of bringing economic pressure to bear on a given company or industry.

"By European standards," says Mr. Levinson, "unions in the United States are strike happy. Over here they just don't understand the technique of shutting down a plant and keeping it shut down until their demands are met." One important reason, explains Victor Feather, assistant general secretary of the British Trades Union Congress, is the organization's breadth of membership. "We can't go pulling 2.5 million men out for long," he says. "It would wreck the whole country."

A 1- OR 2-DAY STRIKE

"We call a strike of 1 or 2 days to demonstrate to the government we want something," says Italy's Mr. Perroni. "When the politicians see our solidarity, then they'll bring pressure on the employers to settle."

Finally the European auto worker—to judge from interviews with many of them—is not nearly as concerned about his pay as his American counterpart. Employers and union leaders generally agree, and offer a number of explanations.

"We're very realistic," claims the TUC's Mr. Feather. "Our economy is very definitely built on exports. The U.S. workers gets twice as much as the English worker, but his cost of living is higher, too. If we got our wages up to the same level as yours, our living costs would just go up with them. Besides, then we couldn't sell our cars in your country and we'd be out of work. We'd be a lot of ruddy fools to do that."

And certainly one of the most important factors in the attitude of European workers is the extent of their company-and-government-provided social benefits. In France, notes Mr. Delamarre, about a third of the average worker's income is in the form of such fringes—and in Italy it is even higher.

WORKERS DON'T CARE

"The portion of the wage beyond the actual cash is growing more and more important," Mr. Levinson observes, "so workers don't really care much about collective bargaining."

Moreover, even where cash alone is considered, auto workers usually are among the best paid factory workers in every country. If they are not, as in Italy, the aristocrats of the working class, they are at least conscious of better economic conditions than most. This, too, appears to cool some of the ardor they might otherwise have for strong action to increase their slice of their employers' profits.

OREGON PTA SCHOOL OFFICIALS OPPOSE SLASH IN FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREA FUNDS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the House Education and Labor Committee is currently conducting hearings on administration proposals to reduce Federal funds paid to local school districts which confront unusual demands upon their facilities due to the impact of Federal workers' families.

This proposed legislation is of considerable importance to my State. It would adversely affect 87 Oregon schools located in 22 counties. Total financial loss to Oregon if the proposals, which would amend Public Law 874 and 815, were implemented would amount to over $300,000. In view of the heavy financial burden carried by our school districts in their efforts to maintain minimum educational standards in the face of normal enrollment rises, a decrease in Federal payments to aid in paying the unusual costs incurred through utilization of school facilities by children of Federal workers.

Mr. President, on July 17 the board of managers of the Oregon Congress of Parents and Teachers met at Monmouth, Oreg., for its midsummer session. At that time the Board declared its strong opposition to the administration proposal. Mrs. David McCarthy, legislative director of the Oregon PTA Congress, wrote me of the group's action. She stated that:

I reported the move in Congress to cut appropriations for federally impacted areas by revising the formula for distribution. Since this would cut Oregon's share of the Federal funds by some $315,791 to those districts where unusual demands have been made upon their school facilities, it was our belief that this decrease will have a very diverse effect upon those districts. Representatives from federally impacted areas explained that school budgets have been based upon the assumption that this money would

be forthcoming. The Board of Managers strongly recommended that Oregon's congressional representatives oppose the passage of H.R. 7140 and S. 1939, which would reduce these funds.

Mr. President, I spoke on the Senate floor on June 1 of this year in opposition to the proposed reduction in Public Law 815 and 874 funds. I reiterate that position today. I am confident that the hearings now underway in the House will reveal the ill-advised nature of the administration plan.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks several letters which I have received from Oregon school officials outlining in some detail the perilous consequences which would follow the enactment of such legislation.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McKENZIE RIVER SCHOOLS,
DISTRICT NO. 68,
Finn Rock, Oreg., June 6, 1959.

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: It is probable that the following information will be too late to be of value to you, but I would like to express myself with regard to what Federal aid has meant to this school district. As you are no doubt aware, this district is faced with a tremendous impact of Cougar Dam which will probably very nearly double our school population. It is probable that large districts could absorb two or three hundred additional students without too much difficulty, but such an increase to a small district assumes major proportions.

This district has made every effort to meet the demands of the increasing population and we feel that we have succeeded to a high degree. This success has been to some degree due to the aid we have received from Public Law 874, with close to 50 percent of our students at the present time eligible for reimbursement under this law. You can readily see that the factor of federally connected youngsters is a major cost item to us. Even with this large percentage, our entitlement has run between $12,000 and $20,000 for the last several years; this, of course, is not a very large percentage of our total operational budget of $175,000. You can readily understand what would happen when that percentage skyrockets with the advent of labor on the Cougar project.

We have made application for substantial aid in 22,000 square feet of new construction which will be carried out this summer. This application has been made under Public Law 815, and this is the first time we have exercised our eligibility under this law.

It would certainly appear to the people of this district that Federal school aid is not only just, but a due obligation when the impact of federally connected youngsters reaches the population that it has in our situation. We know that you will exercise every effort to enable small districts such as ours to fulfill the obligations of education that are paramount at this time, and do so with the cost assumed by the agency that is responsible—in this case federally connected families.

I will be glad to supply additional statistical data or information that might be of value to you or desired by you.

Very truly yours,
BEN C. HUNTINGTON,
Superintendent, McKenzie River Schools.

KNOX BUTTE SCHOOL,
Albany, Oreg., June 2, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: It has just come to my attention that the present administration is proposing to reduce Federal school aid to impacted districts from 50 to 25 percent of per pupil cost where parents employed by Government reside in school districts outside communities where they work.

Although time and space does not permit me to give a detailed account at this time, I should like to submit the following statements.

Our district is located on the edge of Albany, Oreg., in Linn County. We are very close to the former Camp Adair area where the SAGE installation and other air defense installations are being erected.

We are already feeling the effect of children moving into the district where their parents work on this property. Our district is in effect a "bedroom" district of Albany. We have an assessed valuation of only some $360,000 with an anticipated enrollment of over 200 this fall in our elementary school. (We are elementary district only.)

We desperately need any funds available under present plans, let alone any reduction. The district finds itself scraping bottom to even house the children we now have. The district actually voted money from its already thin operating budget in order to help build a single needed room. Bonding capacity was so limited as not to be able to build one classroom.

Please give your support to maintaining what help we now can expect. I trust that this letter is not too late.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD F. DUNBAR,
Principal.

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 30, CONSOLIDATED,
Warrenton, Oreg., June 1, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Word has come to us indicating proposed cuts under the provisions of Public Law 874. It would deprive us of approximately $4,000 per year, or the amount needed to pay one teacher.

We would appreciate very much a legislature that would be favorable to a continuation of the provisions of this law.

We in education are faced with many financial problems—chiefly lack of State and Federal support, no sales tax, and property owners that are near revolt.

It may well be education's fault. The high cost of our secondary schools could be cut way down by selection of students on the basis of desire and ability. So far our educational philosophy has not been selective.

To get down on your hands and knees each year and pray the public for the financial approval for continued existence of one of the greatest blessings available to mankind, and at the same time perform the service of the master teacher, seems to strain the limits of human endurance.

If these pithy comments will aid you in your decisions we are thankful.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD B. KNOTTS,
Superintendent of Schools.

CLATSKANIE UNION HIGH SCHOOL,
DISTRICT NO. U. H. 5,
Clatskanie, Oreg., May 29, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Clatskanie Union High School is one of the school districts which receives Federal funds under Public Law 874. During the year of 1958–59 the amount of $2,860.65 was received, on the basis of 16 students whose parents work on U.S. Government property, from the application filed for the 1957–58 school year. During the school year 1958–59, 20 students have been enrolled whose parents work on U.S. Government property.

It is expected that for the next few years the number of such students enrolled here will increase by approximately the same percentage. I understand that there is a possibility that the amount received under Public Law 874 might be reduced approximately 10 percent. In a few years, at the above rate of increase, this would amount to a loss of nearly $500 to this district.

Perhaps this information will be useful to you in considering the effects of any changes that might be made in Public Law 874.

Yours truly,
WM. F. HARCOMBE,
Principal.

ALBANY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Albany, Oreg., May 26, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I have been informed that legislation has been proposed which would reduce the Federal assistance for school districts under Public Law 874.

A reduction of reimbursement from the present 50 percent figure to 25 percent as proposed on pupils whose parents work on Federal property but do not reside on Federal property, would have caused our district to lose $6,040 this year, which would have to be made up by adding 0.6 mill to our local property tax.

Further, with an increase in enrollment coming during the next year due to the SAGE project at Camp Adair, our district would be much more seriously affected.

Sincerely yours,
A. E. PALMER,
Superintendent.

THE TRAGEDY OF FORCED INTEGRATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on last Thursday I delivered to the Senate some remarks regarding the critical racial conditions existing in New York City; and I placed in the RECORD an article, from the August 3 issue of U.S. News & World Report, to the effect that New York City was sitting on a powder keg.

Basically, what I told the Senate was that New York City, with all its laws requiring integration, has the worst racial unrest, the worst prejudice, and the worst police problem of any city in America. I pointed out that, in contrast, in the South, where there are no laws forcing integration, Negroes and whites live side by side, work together, and do this in peace and harmony. I further pointed out that these people have mutual respect for one another, and not the hate which we find in areas where there is forced integration. In short, it is evident that forced integration is detrimental to the spiritual, moral, economic, and social welfare of people; whereas segregation tends to preserve these finer qualities in people of all races.

Since my remarks appeared in the RECORD and were published in the newspapers all over the Nation, I have received a great deal of mail on the subject.

All of this mail endorses the U.S. News & World Report's position and my remarks. I have not received a single piece of mail contradicting or criticizing my statements. To the contrary, all of this mail received from the Metropolitan New York area gives tragic emphasis to what the magazine U.S. News & World Report reported, and certainly adds credence to my allegation that forced integration is wrong for our people.

Those who have written to me state that they do not want their names used, for fear of reprisal. Their letters tell me that they are fearful of going on the streets after dark, and cite instances of murder, rape, and mob violence that know no equal elsewhere in our land. Along with these letters came articles from newspapers describing the horrible situation that exists as the result of forced integration in New York City.

One resident said she was 65 years old and was quite bitter at being a prisoner in her own home. "I hate it," she said, "but I want to die natural," meaning that she did not want to be mugged, raped, robbed, or beaten on the streets of her native city.

One man 67 years old said that he and his wife never go to a movie at night any more, because of fear of violence on the street.

An article in the New York Mirror, dated Thursday, June 11, carried a five-column headline, "Where Terror Roams the Street." I quote from this New York newspaper:

> Muggings are common and seldom reported to police. Purse snatching is even more frequent. Women are accosted. Sidewalks are blocked by groups of menacing, sneering, beer-drinking inhabitants. * * *
>
> Longtime residents of the apartment buildings that overlook Central Park and the Hudson no longer stir from their homes at night. If there is a compelling reason they hail a cab even to go just a few blocks.

Mr. President, one of the letters sent to me states that New York "is a jungle. I was born here and lived here all of my life, and every day I hear people say the South is 100 percent right"—on the question of integration.

Another letter states that the great leaders of integration and civil rights legislation would not dare to walk through Central Park, Prospect Park, or Morningside Park after dark without a police guard. This writer went on to say that a stranger would not dare to walk on 134th Street between Lenox and 7th Avenue, in Harlem, after dark without an armed guard.

Mr. President, one woman even wrote to say that the churches and synagogues in some areas of New York have discontinued evening services, because the women are fearful of being attacked at night on the streets.

I regret that I must point out to the Senate this situation; but in each letter the fears expressed are of one race versus another race. This is not just an ordinary crime problem. It is a crime problem which has resulted from forced integration that has generated the most violent hatred and prejudice ever created in any area of America. I warn, as I have warned on innumerable previous occasions, that if the drive to ram civil rights legislation through the Congress and onto the people of these United States is continued, the conditions existing in New York will spread to every corner of this land.

I ask the proponents of civil rights legislation: Do you think that by passing more laws enforcing integration you will enable the churches and synagogues of New York to reopen at night, or will you have to hire thousands of additional policemen to insure the civil rights of those people in New York City?

I think what we need, as I have said before, is more segregation and less forced integration, if we want to preserve law and order, not only in places such as New York, but elsewhere across the Nation.

I wish to assure everyone in New York that I am not picking on New York City; but all these statistics, letters, these newspaper reports, these magazine reports about such conditions have emanated from New York. It is a deep, stark tragedy that this situation has developed and has reached this point.

EUROPEAN REFUGEE PROBLEMS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an article published in Saltzburg Nachrichten on May 21 of this year. The article describes the suicide of a 29-year-old Yugoslav girl who escaped from Tito's "socialistic paradise" and was brutally returned to Tito by the Austrian authorities.

Marica Hrastovčak, the name of this most recent victim, came to Austria in October 1958. The Austrian authorities, after hearing her case, decided to return her to the Yugoslav communistic authorities on November 5. But Marica could not reconcile herself to the life of a slave, to which the Austrian police action was forcing her back. After having finished serving her prison term, she crossed the border for a second time on April 28. Her earlier experience had taught her not to make her presence known to the local authorities in Austria, for she hoped that one day she could cross into Germany, where the escapees from the communistic regime were known to receive more humane treatment. But she met with bad luck; on April 30, she was caught by the Austrian frontier guards at the very moment when she was preparing to leave Austria. She was brought back to Salzburg prison, where, dreading the possibility of being once more returned to Tito, she committed suicide.

The Saltzburg Nachrichten, in reporting this tragic event, comments that this is just a repetition of incidents which often are taking place in Austria these days. It further states the need to ask publicly: "Isn't it time to stop this forceful return of escapees to the Communists hell, handing the victims over to their executioners?"

That this is not an isolated case is shown by another news items which appeared in Time magazine on April 27, 1959. It describes the suicide of another Yugoslav girl, Smilja Srca. Smilja escaped to Austria, where she found a family which hired her to look after their children. She was happy to be given an opportunity to lead a decent life, earning her living in a free country; and soon she won the sympathies of the entire family, and made many friends. In the meantime, the investigating Austrian authorities decided that she was an economic escapee, and ordered her back to Yugoslavia.

The eve of the day when she was to be deported, she took leave from the children for whom she had cared for 3 months, wrote a farewell message in Serbo-Croatian to her kind employers, went out into the cold April night in the land of the Alps, and with a bullet, ended her young life.

This bullet, at the same time, also killed an illusion.

And not just one.

These two cases, so close to our times, and bearing in mind the fact that women were involved, demand and call for a reexamination of the very difficult situation of the Yugoslav refugees who are denied sanctuary by the Austrian and Italian authorities.

Official Austrian statistics report that in the course of 1958, 4,852 persons fled from Yugoslavia. Over one-half of these were forced back under the pretext that they were all economic refugees.

Mr. President, this problem should be taken into serious consideration by the international organizations dealing with the refugees. The world's humanitarian organizations should also get interested. We all recall how the society for the protection of animals' lives protested when the Soviets sent their dog into space. Do we value human lives less? Let us hope that the Yugoslav refugees will find better hospitality in the hearts and conscience of public opinion in the free world.

Differentiating the escapees into political and economic escapees is a self-instituted interpretation of the Geneva convention by the Austrian authorities. The brutal treatment, by forcing the return of those who are declared to be "economic" refugees, is utterly condemnable.

Governments of the free world can do a great deal toward the solution of this problem by opening their doors to these unfortunate persons, by changing immigration procedures. This would decrease the number of refugees in Austria and, at the same time, would have an effect on the Austrian police and put a stop to the forceful return of refugees.

The latent public conscience of the free nations must be awakened. This, not only in the name of democracy, but in the name of anticommunism, in the name of freedom and the right to asylum, and finally, in the name of humanitarianism.

I ask unanimous consent at this point in my statement to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from Time magazine of April 27, 1959, an article of June 8, 1959, from the Hrvatski Glas—Croatian Voice—and a news story from Ameriska

Domovina—American Home—of April 23, 1959.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hrvatski Glas, June 8, 1959]

THE TRAGEDY OF A CROAT GIRL

VIENNA, May 27.—Marica Hrastovcak, aged 29, poisoned herself in the police jail of Saltzburg, swallowing a considerable quantity of shoe polish and died of poisoning in the hospital on May 20.

She poisoned herself because of the intention of the Austrian authorities to return her again to Yugoslavia, where she had already been returned once before and consequently escaped again into Austria.

Attempting to get to Germany she was caught near the border and jailed. She preferred death rather than to be returned by force to Yugoslavia.

The Arbeiter Zeitung published an editorial calling for a revision of the rules for granting the right of asylum to Yugoslav refugees. The newspaper relates that "according to the news about the refugees on the Yugoslav border it is becoming clear that actually half of the refugees coming from Yugoslavia into Austria are returned; not being able to prove the status of a political refugee."

[From Time magazine, Apr. 27, 1959]

AUSTRIA—THE PROBLEM OF THE REFUGEE

In 3 short months the pretty, blue-eyed servant girl had found friends, a good job, and happiness under Austrian freedom. But last week 19-year-old Smilja Srca was ordered by the Austrian Government to return to Yugoslavia. Leaving her mistress a thank-you note in a language the lady could not read, Smilja told the family children goodbye, crept out into the Alpine night and put a bullet through her head. She survived, but the bullet destroyed the optic nerve connections of both eyes, and she will never see again.

Austrians everywhere felt sorry for Smilja—but having accepted a million refugees from communism since World War II, they were still in no mood to change Austria's present restrictive policies toward immigrants. Involved in Austria's dilemma is the unsolved international problem of what is a refugee.

Over the postwar years a dozen nationalities have streamed into Austria, seeking asylum, filling refugee camps, and—despite large-scale international aid—burdening the Austrian economy. After the influx of nearly 200,000 Hungarians, Austria in self-defense decided to limit the flow. Reading between the lines of the Geneva Refugee Convention, Austria decided to distinguish economic refugees from political refugees. Since economic refugees are those in quest of a better life—not (in the language of the convention) fleeing persecution—Austria concluded that they could be deported.

Legally under the code they can. Humanely, as the Smilja incident dramatically illustrated, grave problems are raised in consigning returnees to an uncertain fate back home. Since most Yugoslavs are economic refugees, more than half the 4,852 who crossed the Austro-Yugoslavian border since the crackdown began New Year's Day 1958 have been returned.

[From Ameriska Domovina, April 23, 1959]

THE UNFORTUNATE FATE OF THE REFUGEE WHO WOULD HAVE HAD TO RETURN—A YOUNG GIRL WHOM THE AUSTRIAN AUTHORITIES TRIED TO RETURN TO YUGOSLAVIA, TRIED TO COMMIT SUICIDE AND BECAME BLIND—THE RETURNING CONTINUES

CLEVELAND, OHIO.—The newspaper Times tells of a pretty, young girl who fled from Yugoslavia, found employment as a servant and had been getting along satisfactorily already for several months when the announcement suddenly came that they would return her to Yugoslavia.

During the night the girl left the family for whom she had been working, went out into the dark and fired a bullet into her head. In the hospital it is true her life was saved but she will remain blind for the optic nerve was severed.

The sad fate of Smilja Srce has once again brought the world's attention to the question of returning the so-called state refugees to Yugoslavia. Since New Year's Day of 1958 when new strict rules came into effect, the Austrian authorities have returned about half of the 4,852 persons who fled there from Yugoslavia.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, early this year, the Zellerbach Commission on the European Refugee Situation submitted an excellent report on European refugee problems.

Serving on the Commission were Mr. Harold L. Zellerbach, president, Crown-Zellerbach Corp.; the Honorable Angier Biddle Duke, president, International Rescue Committee; the Honorable Eugenie Anderson, former U.S. Ambassador to Denmark; Mr. Irving Brown, European Representative, AFL–CIO; Mrs. David Levy, member, New York State Youth Commission; Mr. Eugene Lyons, senior editor, the Reader's Digest; and the Right Reverend James A. Pike, bishop of California, Protestant Episcopal Church of California.

As a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts, dealing with the determination of refugee status and the special section dealing with Austria's treatment of refugees, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DETERMINATION OF REFUGEE STATUS

Ideally, a refugee from communism who chooses a path that leads him to one part of the free world should receive the same treatment as a refugee who chooses some other path to freedom. In practice, the conditions of reception and treatment and the standards of eligibility for refugee status vary tremendously from one country to another, and, for that matter, from one period to another within each country. Nothing points this up more dramatically than the current treatment of Yugoslav refugees in Austria, Italy, Greece, Germany, and France. It is, for example, difficult to understand why, on the one hand, two-thirds of the Yugoslav refugees escaping into Italy and all of those who reach France should be granted refugee status, while on the other hand approximately two-thirds of those who escape to Austria should be returned to Yugoslavia, and two-thirds of those who reach Germany should be denied refugee status, but not returned to Yugoslavia. It is also difficult to understand why Yugoslavs who escaped prior to 1956 were, with few exceptions, considered worthy of eligibility, whereas, the majority of those who escaped during the course of 1958 were considered unworthy of eligibility.

On the basis of information which came to it, the Commission could not help wondering whether the refugee who is being screened for eligibility is, in effect, not placed in the position of having to "prove his innocence," and whether he is not too frequently denied eligibility on the basis of unconfirmed suspicion.

Far more important than any economic suffering to which he may be subjected by denial of refugee status, is the psychological impact of such denial on the refugee. The significance of this denial to him is that he is unwanted. Having lived under a political regime where the scrap of paper which identifies a person controls his entire destiny, and having abandoned national and legal status in the act of escaping, the refugee tends to look upon his certificate of eligibility almost as a proof of his personal existence. The refugee's attitude may be exaggerated—but there can be no doubt that the denial of status is for him a cruel and sometimes shattering experience.

AUSTRIA

The eligibility procedures employed in Austria must be viewed against this background. They are not procedures established for the purpose of dealing fairly and generously, in the traditional Austrian spirit, with the new escapees from Yugoslavia. On the contrary, their purpose is to produce a very high rate of return and in this way to discourage other Yugoslavs who are thinking of escaping to Austria. On this point some of the Austrian authorities were quite frank. Nevertheless, the Austrian eligibility procedures provide an interesting contrast with those in Italy.

Refugees arriving in Austria are detained as prisoners, pending a determination of their eligibility, either at Camp Annapichl in Carinthia, or Camp Wagna in Styria. It is true that this is a "light imprisonment," as one Austrian police official described it. But as light as it may be, the fact remains that the refugees are kept under lock and key and they have no access to voluntary agency representatives or legal counselors during this period.

A competent observer who sat in on a number of these preliminary interviews by minor officials of the Austrian police force said that the refugees would sometimes go white in the face when questions were barked at them and the answers they gave all met with apparent disbelief.

The police interrogators prepare a dossier in each case. Most of the information contained in the dossier is simple biographical data. The key paragraph consists of a résumé of the refugee's reasons for escaping, as understood and prepared by the police interrogator.

In a majority of the cases the decisions by the Austrian eligibility officers are based simply on the reading of the dossier. An officer goes through the dossiers and divides them into three groups: (1) Those who are considered political refugees and to whom asylum is accordingly granted, (2) those who are considered economic refugees and who will, therefore, be turned back to the Yugoslav authorities, and (3) those cases about which the eligibility officer feels that further information is necessary. Only in the case of this latter category does the deciding officer personally interview the refugee in question. The eligibility officers whom the Commission met were men of humanitarian spirit and intelligence; one had the impression that they were captives of procedures and policies about which they had personal misgivings.

As a rough estimate, it was stated that the High Commissioner's representative suggests a review of about 50 percent of the rejectees and that approximately 50 percent of these reviews result in reversals. After all this has been done, the rate of return is 50 to 60 percent.

The manner in which the returns are initiated was described by many refugees who had passed through the detention centers. Periodically, there is a rollcall. As each name is called, the refugee is told to report to one part of the camp or to another. Everyone knows what this means: one of the groups is going to be returned. The refugees said that whenever such a rollcall was announced, a pall of terror would fall over the camp. What happens be-

yond that point is something for which there has been no eyewitness. Having seen refugees who were speechless with terror at the prospect of being returned, it is difficult to believe that all of those who are turned over to the Yugoslav authorities go peaceably. There are rumors that quite a few of the refugees must be sent back in handcuffs. This may explain why the process of returning the refugees is not something to which the press is invited.

IN DEFENSE OF RECLAMATION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, James D. Corriell, editorial writer for the Boulder Camera, Boulder, Colo., has written an editorial entitled "In Defense of Reclamation," which appeared in the Camera for Friday, July 17, 1959.

Mr. Corriell has reduced to short and readable form the basic argument for continuing the reclamation program in our effort to conserve what is perhaps the most valuable of our natural resources—our water. I commend most heartily "In Defense of Reclamation" as profitable reading to all my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF RECLAMATION

When you go poking around a beehive it's a good idea to know something about bees.

Prof. Charles Hardin of the University of Chicago courted a few welts this week when he poked his academic finger into Western reclamation. He also got his feet tangled up in his own logic and stumbled precariously near the fringes of fiction.

Professor Hardin, who as a visiting professor at the University of Colorado has reportedly been telling his students the U.S. Constitution should be junked, told the Western Resources Conference this week that reclamation money might better be spent on occasionally dry eastern land than on the reclamation of arid western land for agriculture.

Then he set forth some arguments against reclamation itself, knocking the props from under his main point. He said reclamation is getting too high priced inasmuch as the most feasible projects, in his opinion, already have been completed. And he charged that irrigation under reclamation projects aggravates the surplus crop problem.

Now if reclamation is that bad, how can it be seriously proposed that eastern lands be put under reclamation-type irrigation during the dry cycles?

Professor Hardin's claim regarding the crop-surplus problem is for the most part untrue, for nearly all crops made possible by irrigation of arid regions are not in surplus. One exception is cotton, but the increase of this crop through reclamation is negligible.

His further argument that the returns are greater on water used in industry than on water used for farming is no argument at all. That's like saying manufactured gadgets are cheaper than vegetables; therefore, let's abolish groceries.

The simple fact is that water is vital to every human activity. It costs more for some activities than others. It will produce more in some activities than others. But whatever the water costs, all needs must be served.

We don't say eastern lands should not get the irrigation they need. We don't say industrial water use should be subordinated to agricultural use. We don't say water in the West is more economical than water in the East.

But we have seen what reclamation has done for the vast Platte Valley, which early geographers included in the Great American Desert. We have seen what irrigation has done for the Utah desert area settled by the Mormons. We have seen vast sagebrush desert lands in southern Idaho transformed into productive farmlands by reclamation. We have seen what irrigation has done for huge arid regions in California. The list could go on and on.

With the appalling population expansion problem that faces us in the immediate future, we had better be preparing livable space for more people and arable land to feed them. The crop surplus problem will not be with us long as hungry mouths multiply during the next few years.

It is no time now to pit reclamation needs of one section against those of another. It is no time to quibble about financial returns of one human activity as compared with another. It is no time to belittle man's ability to conquer his environment. It is no time for a philosophy of defeatism—whether expressed in a desire to junk the Constitution or to junk reclamation.

It is rather a time for us to recapture the spirit of the Founding Fathers and of the pioneers who opened the West—the spirit of conquest over hostile forces, whether political, natural, economic, or social. The era before us calls for more reclamation, not less; more conservation of natural resources, not less; more faith in human resources, not less.

And this applies not to the West alone, but much more to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. What is the business now pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no business pending before the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1289. An act to increase and extend the special milk program for children; and

S. 1512. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to transfer responsibility for making appraisals from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21, 34, and 38 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8 and 40, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8283) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 163. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the crediting of service of U.S. commissioners for purposes of such act;

H.R. 383. An act to authorize the annexation of certain real property of the United States by the city of Wyandotte, Mich.;

H.R. 2188. An act to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinault Tribe;

H.R. 2245. An act to amend subsection 432 (g) of title 14, United States Code, so as to increase the limitation on basic compensation of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard from $3,750 to $5,100 per annum;

H.R. 2405. An act to amend section 101 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that a child shall be deemed to be the adopted child of a veteran where the child was a member of the veteran's household and is adopted by the spouse of the veteran within 2 years of the veteran's death;

H.R. 2465. An act to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of Commerce of certain lands in Arlington County, Va.;

H.R. 2773. An act to amend section 1701 of title 38, United States Code, to provide the same educational benefits for children of Spanish-American War veterans who died of a service-connected disability as are provided for children of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict;

H.R. 2934. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla.;

H.R. 4329. An act to provide for the conveyance to any public or private organization of the State of Virginia of certain dwellings acquired in connection with the Chantilly Airport site, Virginia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4938. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect;

H.R. 5849. An act to amend the act of July 7, 1958, providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, relating to selection by the State of Alaska of certain lands made subject to lease, permit, license, or contract;

H.R. 5888. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Massachusetts Port Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, certain lands and improvements thereon comprising a portion of the so-called E Street Annex, South Boston Annex, Boston Naval Shipyard, in South Boston, Mass., in exchange for certain other lands;

H.R. 6861. An act to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6939. An act to repeal the act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741), as amended (48 U.S.C., secs. 432–452), and for other purposes;

H.R. 7112. An act to amend section 1005 (c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the use of certified mail for service of process, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7373. An act to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing to certain veterans seriously disabled during a period of war;

H.R. 7629. An act to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans under section 17 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7948. An act to declare nonnavigable a part of the west arm of the South Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River situated in the city of Chicago in the State of Illinois, as hereinafter described; and

H.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to provide for the honorary designation of Saint Ann's Churchyard in the city of New York as a national historic site.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 166) providing the express approval of the Congress under section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, of the disposal of rough cuttable gem-quality diamonds, cut and polished gem-quality diamonds, osmium, rhodium, ruthenium, and zircon concentrates from the national stockpile, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 577. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, section 2481, to authorize the United States Coast Guard to sell certain utilities in the immediate vicinity of a Coast Guard activity not available from local sources;

S. 906. An act to amend section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to clarify the meaning of the term "change of program of education or training" as used in such section;

S. 1110. An act to amend the act of August 4, 1955 (Public Law 237, 84th Congress), to provide for conveyance of certain interests in the lands covered by such act;

S. 1367. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard", to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft;

S. 1694. An act to extend the existing authority to provide hospital and medical care for veterans who are U.S. citizens temporarily residing abroad to include those with peacetime service-incurred disabilities;

S. 2153. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to accept, operate, and maintain a certain defense housing facility at Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes;

S. 2183. An act granting the consent of Congress to interstate compacts for the development or operation of airport facilities;

H.R. 697. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire certain real property in the county of Solano, Calif., to transfer certain real property in the county of Solano, Calif., and for other purposes; and

H.R. 3322. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, and certain other laws to authorize the payment of transportation and travel allowances to escorts of dependents of members of the uniformed services under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 163. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the crediting of service of U.S. commissioners for purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 383. An act to authorize the annexation of certain real property of the United States by the city of Wyandotte, Mich.;

H.R. 2188. An act to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinault Tribe;

H.R. 2245. An act to amend subsection 432(g) of title 14, United States Code, so as to increase the limitation on basic compensation of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard from $3,750 to $5,100 per annum; and

H.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to provide for the honorary designation of St. Ann's Churchyard in the city of New York as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2405. An act to amend section 101 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that a child shall be deemed to be the adopted child of a veteran where the child was a member of the veteran's household and is adopted by the spouse of the veteran within 2 years of the veteran's death; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2465. An act to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of Commerce of certain lands in Arlington County, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2773. An act to amend section 1701 of title 38, United States Code, to provide the same educational benefits for children of Spanish-American War veterans who died of a service-connected disability as are provided for children of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; and

H.R. 7373. An act to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing to certain veterans seriously disabled during a period of war; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 2934. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla.; and

H.R. 5888. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Massachusetts Port Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, certain lands and improvements thereon comprising a portion of the so-called E Street Annex, South Boston Annex, Boston Naval Shipyard, in South Boston, Mass., in exchange for certain other lands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4329. An act to provide for the conveyance to any public or private organization of the State of Virginia of certain dwellings acquired in connection with the Chantilly airport site, Virginia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7112. An act to amend section 1005 (c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the use of certified mail for service of process, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7948. An act to declare nonnavigable a part of the west arm of the South Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River situated in the city of Chicago in the State of Illinois, as hereinafter described; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4938. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect; and

H.R. 6861. An act to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 5849. An act to amend the act of July 7, 1958, providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, relating to selection by the State of Alaska of certain lands made subject to lease, permit, license, or contract; and

H.R. 6939. An act to repeal the act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741), as amended (48 U.S.C., secs. 432–452), and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 166) providing the express approval of the Congress under section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, of the disposal of rough cuttable gem-quality diamonds, cut and polished gem-quality diamonds, osmium, rhodium, ruthenium, and zircon concentrates from the national stockpile, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress expressly approves, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (53 Stat. 811, as amended; 50 U.S.C. 98b(e)), the disposal of the following materials from the national stockpile in accordance with the plans of disposal published by General Services Administration in the Federal Register on the dates indicated—

(a) approximately forty-seven thousand and forty-nine carats of rough cuttable gem-quality diamonds and eight thousand four hundred and twelve carats of cut and polished gem-quality diamonds, Federal Register of August 5, 1958 (23 F.R. 5944);

(b) approximately twenty-seven troy ounces of osmium, two thousand five hundred and fifteen troy ounces of rhodium and fifty-one troy ounces of ruthenium, Federal Register of August 15, 1958 (23 F.R. 6311); and

(c) approximately fifteen thousand nine hundred and two short dry tons of zircon concentrates, Federal Register of March 13, 1959 (24 F.R. 1844).

All funds derived from the sales authorized by this concurrent resolution shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

INCREASE IN MAXIMUM OIL AND GAS ACREAGE LIMITATION, STATE OF ALASKA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 577, Senate bill 1855.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to, will the Senator state what bill that is?

Mr. KUCHEL. That is the Alaska mineral leasing bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1855) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, in order to increase certain acreage limitations with respect to the State of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate lay aside the pending bill, Order No. 577, Senate bill 1855, and proceed to the immediate consideration of the House-passed companion bill, Order No. 603, House bill 6940, of the same title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6940) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 in order to increase certain acreage limitations with respect to the State of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 6940?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I urge the passage of H.R. 6940, which is identical in intent, purpose, and objectives to Calendar No. 577, S. 1855.

Both bills provide for the adjustment of the amount of acreage available for oil and gas leasing in Alaska so as to make it comparable to the amount of similar acreage available in the other 48 States, taking into consideration the far larger size of Alaska and the higher costs of exploration and development there.

The difference between the two bills is only one of drafting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I have no statement to make in reference to the bill. The Senate bill was introduced in May by my colleague [Mr. GRUENING], for himself and for me, in response to many suggestions from citizens of Alaska. I think it is a good bill. The proposed legislation will be helpful in the development of oil and gas within Alaska.

The situation which brought about the need for an amendment to the existing law is being presented by my colleague. I wish to congratulate him for reporting the bill. I am hopeful the suggestion that the House version be accepted in lieu of the Senate bill will be agreed to, and that the bill will be passed by the Senate and signed into law by the President. The accomplishment of this objective will be an aid to oil and gas development in Alaska, which has now engaged the interest and attention of practically all the major oil companies in the United States, many of the smaller ones, and many independent producers.

We are confidently looking forward to the discovery of a great oil area, which we expect will be an instrumental factor in the economic advancement of the 49th State.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am sorry that at this particular moment there are comparatively few Members of the Senate on the floor to discuss what I think is a bill of very far reaching import about which I have had my personal reservations, as both Senators from Alaska are aware.

The comments which I propose to make are comments generally of which at least the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has been completely aware, because I have discussed the matter with him both in the subcommittee and in the full committee.

The bill pending before the Senate, H.R. 6940, proposes to amend the law which is designed to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil shale, sodium, and potassium on the public lands and public domain.

The particular purpose of the bill is to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, in order to increase certain acreage limitations with respect to the State of Alaska.

In order to understand fully what is involved, and to make a complete legislative record, which is what I intend to do at this time, I think we ought to realize, first, the following facts:

In the Mineral Leasing Act—the act of February 25, 1920, found at 41 Stat. 437, and codified at 30 United States Code, section 181, and following sections, as it has been amended—Congress in a single piece of legislation declared its policy to be that the thereafter oil and gas resources—as well as oil shale, coal, phosphate, and sodium, with potassium—potash—by a 1927 amendment—in and on the public lands of the United States would be disposed of only under a leasing system.

It should be made clear that we are talking about the leasing of public lands. This has nothing to do with the leasing of private lands in any respect; it covers only lands owned by the Federal Government, which in essence belong to each and every one of the people of the United States. The lands involved are defined as original public domain lands which have never left Federal ownership; also, lands in Federal ownership which were obtained by the Government in exchange for public lands or for timber on such lands; also, public domain lands which have reverted to Federal ownership through operation of the public land laws. Those are the three ways in which the Federal Government has obtained title to these lands, the lands which would be involved in the amendment of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

Public lands must thus be distinguished from "acquired lands," lands which have been obtained by the United States by purchase, condemnation, or gift or by exchange for such purchased, condemned, or donated lands or for timber on such lands. The Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands, enacted on August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913; 30 U.S.C. 351–359), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits and leases for deposits of oil, gas oil shale, coal, phosphate, sodium and potassium in lands acquired by the United States, including such lands in Alaska, and subject to the same conditions as obtain in the case of public lands. In other words, mineral leasing on acquired lands proceeds the same as on public lands, but the acreage limitations apply separately.

Finally, with respect to mineral leasing of Federal oil and gas resources, there is the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 462; 43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.). As Members know, this act had as its principal object and purpose declaring it to be the policy of the United States that the subsoil and seabeds of the Outer Continental Shelf—explicitly leaving unaffected the character of the high seas above the shelf and the rights to navigation and fishing thereon—appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction, control, and power of disposition, as set forth in the act. That act also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to grant leases or permits for the use of shelf lands, including those for exploration and development of the oil and gas deposits of the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf (67 Stat. 464, 468; 43 U.S.C. 1337). These lands are, and have been leased competitively, and are, of course, the submerged lands seaward of those belonging to the States under the terms of the Submerged Lands Act of May 22, 1953 (67 Stat. 291; 43 U.S.C. 1301); acreage limitations which apply on fast—inland—lands do not apply to shelf lands.

Mineral "leasing" as it appears in Federal law, should be distinguished from the patent system which since 1872 has characterized the Federal system of permitting private development of metalliferous minerals found on lands belonging to the United States. The law is administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

There are two basic types of leases which apply to the lease of oil or gas in public lands competitive and noncompetitive.

When the lands to be leased are within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field, the law—codified

at section 226, title 30, United States Code—requires the lands to be leased to the highest responsible bidder by competitive bidding; successful lessees bid and pay such bonus as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior, and in addition the lessee is required to pay a minimum royalty of 12½ per centum in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease. Leases issued competitively have a primary term of 5 years and continue so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.

When the lands to be leased are not within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field—and this, of course, is the case with respect to the vast majority of lands filed upon and leased—the first person qualified to hold a lease who makes application is entitled to a lease without competitive bidding. These noncompetitive leases are conditioned upon payment of certain annual lease rentals, and also upon the payment by the lessee of a royalty of 12½ percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease. Just as is true in the case of competitive leases, the primary term is fixed at 5 years, continuing so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.

The law does provide, in the case of noncompetitive leases—and all of the provisions I have referred to are found in section 226 of title 30, United States Code—that upon the expiration of the 5-year term, if the lease has been maintained in accordance with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements, the record titleholder is entitled to a single extension of the lease; this single extension is for 5 years if at the end of the primary term the noncompetitive lease in question is on lands not within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field, and for 2 years in case such lease is on lands which are within such a structure. In both cases, the lease continues for as long thereafter as oil or gas is actually produced in paying quantities.

Finally, there is one other distinction: The law for many years has carried certain acreage limitations. Generally, noncompetitive lease acreage is chargeable to the individual; that is, it is assessed against prescribed acreage limitations. Competitive lease acreage is not so chargeable.

LEASE AND OPTION ACREAGE LIMITATIONS

I propose to discuss lease and option acreage limitations, because without an understanding of this subject, no one can understand what the effect of the bill would be or what we are trying to do.

The question has been asked, Since S. 1855 deals with amendments to the acreage limitation provisions to which the Senator refers, would it be possible to state what those acreage limitations are under present law?

Section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act, which is codified at section 184, title 30 of the United States Code, carries the provisions which establish limitations upon the acreage which may be held by one individual under mineral lease within each State. There are two ways in which an individual—and this includes a person, association or corporation—may hold interests in Federal oil and gas leaseholds: He may hold directly, that is, under lease; or he may hold indirectly, that is, under option—and options are required to be nonrenewable and limited to a 3-year term.

An option occurs when a person who has procured a lease on public lands from the Federal Government conveys to some other individual a right to purchase that lease.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to have the Senator from Colorado explain in greater detail the manner in which the option is acquired, and the manner in which the lease is acquired. When the Senator from Colorado speaks of an option, is he speaking of an option to purchase?

Mr. ALLOTT. An option to purchase a lease.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I hope the Senator will pardon me for asking the question, but I should like a little further explanation.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am very happy to give it.

As I explained a moment ago, these leases are issued by the Federal Government upon a competitive or noncompetitive basis. When the leases sought are upon a known oil and gas structure, the bidding for such leases must be competitive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, where the lease is upon a known and established gas structure——

Mr. ALLOTT. Whether it is producing or not. If it is upon a known oil and gas structure, bidding on the lease must be competitive. When it is not upon a known oil or gas structure, the first one who files application has a preference in the securing of the lease, subject to other limitations, which I am about to discuss.

Assume that A has certain leases which he has acquired from the Federal Government in a legal manner, and B also has some leases, which perhaps are adjoining, or which, although they may not be contiguous to the particular piece which A holds, may be close enough to help him block out an area which would protect him in the event he wanted to drill. B would give to A an option to purchase the lease or leases which he held. Ordinarily such options are for 3 years. That is the limitation on such options, and they are also nonrenewable. The limitation can be avoided in several ways which I shall discuss later, but basically it is just a simple matter of granting new options.

An option is a private agreement between two individuals who hold leases.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the statute give the Government the right, for a consideration, to give an option to purchase, which is included in the lease?

Mr. ALLOTT. Not that I am aware of. I think not. The only power the Federal Government has in that respect is to lease.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But under the law the lessee does have the right to assign or convey his lease to a third person.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct—to give an option to another party to purchase the lease, with the approval of the Department.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If he has the right to give an option to purchase, of course, such option to purchase may finally ripen into a complete sale, provided the Federal Government approves.

Mr. ALLOTT. Only a sale of the leasehold; not of the land itself. I think that is an important distinction. It is only a sale of the leasehold which the person has.

There have been several amendments to the acreage limitation provisions. The most recent of these was enacted in 1954. Oil and gas leases not exceeding 46,080 acres in the aggregate and options covering not more than 200,000 acres may be held in any one State, except Alaska—and Alaska was at the time, of course, the Territory of Alaska.

The general limitation laws were not applicable to Alaska. So in response to the questions just asked by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], there is a limitation, on leases of 46,080 acres.

However, in Alaska, at present, 100,000 acres may be held under oil and gas lease by a single party. This is roughly double what they could hold in any other State in the Union; in fact, it is more than double the amount which is allowable.

Total holdings, direct and indirect, then, may not exceed 246,080 acres—46,080 under lease and 200,000 under option—in any one State of the United States. However, in Alaska, the permissible acreage is 300,000—100,000 under lease and 200,000 under option—or roughly 50,000 acres in excess of that in any other State.

OIL AND GAS LEASING RENTALS

The question has been asked: Then Alaska today has special acreage limitation provisions? There have been general references to a requirement of royalty and rental payments. Are these requirements the same in Alaska as in other States?

The answer is: Under the law which governs today, they are. Through the enactment by Congress only last year, rental and royalty provisions in Alaska were brought into conformity with the rental provisions in the other States of the Union.

I commented earlier on royalty requirements and the terms of leases. Rentals are payable annually, on a per-acre basis, in advance; and the law—section 17 of the act, as codified at section 226, title 30, of the United States Code—establishes the minimum rental which the Secretary of the Interior may charge.

The bill being considered today applies only to noncompetitive lease acreage which is chargeable under the law against acreage limitations; that is, not over known structures or producing fields. With respect to such lease acreage, the law, beginning in 1935, established a minimum annual rental charge of 25 cents an acre, except that during

the second and third years rentals are waived unless a valuable deposit of oil or gas is discovered before that time.

For a number of years, under regulations developed pursuant to this provision, the charges have been as follows: 50 cents the first year; second- and third-year rentals are waived; the per-acre rental during the fourth and fifth years is 25 cents an acre—in short, a gross rental of $1 an acre is charged during the initial term of 5 years, or an average of 20 cents an acre a year. For the 6th through the 10th years, in the case of the present renewal of a 5-year lease, the rental is 50 cents an acre annually, or a gross rental of $2.50 for the second 5-year period, making a gross rental per acre during the 10 years of $3.50, or an average annual rental of 35 cents an acre.

DISTRIBUTION OF RENTAL, ROYALTY, AND BONUS INCOME

The question has also been asked: What disposition is made of the income from these Federal oil and gas leases—that is, the income which arises from the payment of bonuses, rentals, and royalties?

The answer is: Provision was made in the original language of the 1920 act—section 35 of that act, codified today, as amended, as section 191 of title 30 of the United States Code—for the payment into the Treasury of the United States and for disbursement or crediting on a fixed formula thereafter to three sources. This applies to all income from all the minerals covered by the act. As it stands today, the disbursement is as follows: 10 percent of such collection is credited to miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States; 37½ percent is paid to the State, including Alaska, within the boundaries of which the leased lands are or were located, with a requirement that they be used by such State or its subdivisions for the construction and maintenance of public roads or for the support of public schools or other public educational institutions, as the respective State legislatures may direct. The remainder, 52½ percent, with the exception of the State of Alaska, is by law paid into, reserved, and appropriated as a part of the reclamation fund for expenditures in the 17 States of the Reclamation West. In the case of Alaska, which does not come under the Federal reclamation law, this 52½ percent is paid to the State of Alaska for disposition as her legislature may see fit.

So in the State of Alaska, of the actual receipts to the State of all sums which are received by way of rental or by royalties from oil produced, 90 percent goes to the State of Alaska, as compared with 52½ percent in the case of other States.

So Alaska presently gets 90 percent of the money received from bonuses, royalties, and rentals resulting from oil and gas leasing activity and production on Federal lands within her area; and of that amount, 37½ percent is earmarked for the purposes indicated.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I believe the Senator from Colorado said that the other States have returned to them 52½ percent. Is that not 37½ percent; and does not 52½ percent go into the reclamation fund?

Mr. ALLOTT. This is what I said:

> Thirty-seven and one-half percent is paid to the State.

Mr. BARTLETT. I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. For disposition as the legislature may direct. The remainder, 52½ percent, with the exception of the State of Alaska, goes into the reclamation fund.

Mr. BARTLETT. And Alaska is not a reclamation State, is it?

Mr. ALLOTT. Alaska is not a reclamation State. In the instance of Alaska, she would take 90 percent for disposition as her legislature might direct.

Mr. BARTLETT. Alaska would take 52½ percent as the legislature might direct, and the other 37½ percent, I believe, would go into the categories which were specified by the Senator a few minutes ago, including roads and education.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. BARTLETT. The 52½ percent may be used according to the discretion of the legislature.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is my understanding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There are other nonreclamation States falling into the same category as Alaska.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes. There are only 17 States which are reclamation States, and with respect to the disposition of revenues from oil produced on the public domain within their borders it would be the same. However, I know of no public lands subject to leasing outside the reclamation States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then the fact is that Alaska would not be occupying a unique position, but with respect to the 52½ percent would be identically situated with all the other nonreclamation States. There are 17 reclamation States. That would mean there are 32 that are not. Alaska is among those 32.

Mr. ALLOTT. I believe that is correct, yes, as to nonreclamation States.

Mr. BARTLETT. Alaska is a nonreclamation State.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the thought in my mind is that Alaska does not occupy a lone, unique position. There are other States in the same category. Is that not true?

Mr. BARTLETT. I cannot answer the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to point out to the Senator from Ohio that this does not generally occur except in the public land States.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that the Senator from Colorado has pointed out the essential difference. The other States are not public land States, and Alaska, of course, is. Ninety-nine percent plus of the land in Alaska is public land.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then with respect to the use of the 90 percent Alaska stands in a lone and isolated position. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. For all practical purposes that is so.

The question has also been asked: Is it correct to say that the bill as introduced would have increased the acreage limitation in Alaska from 100,000 acres under lease and 200,000 acres under option to 1 million acres under either lease or option, or both? The bill as originally introduced did provide for a 1-million-acre limitation. The figure has been reduced in H.R. 6940, now being considered, to 600,000 acres.

As originally introduced and as reported, the bill eliminates the present statutory distinction between leased acreage and option acreage, and would thus permit the holding of 600,000 acres directly, compared with the present direct acreage limitation of 100,000 acres, or the combined lease and option allowable of 300,000 acres.

So, whereas we originally had a limitation of 100,000 acres on leaseholds, we now would have a 600,000 limitation which could be either leasehold or by option.

The question has also been asked: If the bill before the Senate applies only to Alaska—as it does—was any thought given to making changes in the law which applies to all other States comparable to those which are proposed to be made only with respect to Alaska in the pending bill?

For some time there has been pending in the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee proposed legislation which would amend the law so as to eliminate the distinction between lease and option acreages in all the other States. It would not as presently proposed affect the total allowable acreage in the other States, however, and I point out that the other bill has not been acted upon by the Interior Committee as a whole, but is still pending, if I understand its status correctly, before the subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Hearings have been held on it, and if it were approved it would permit 246,080 acres of direct holdings, against the present limitation on direct holdings of 46,080 acres. In other words, there is also a bill pending before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which I anticipate will be acted upon favorably, which amends the present limitation by eliminating the distinction between leaseholds and options, thereby permitting the holding of a total of 246,080 acres of combined leaseholds or options in any one State.

One of the chief reasons for the favorable consideration of the particular bill pending in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and one of the real reasons for doing away in the bill now pending before the Senate with the distinction between option and leasehold, is that because of the difficulty of recording, and because of certain decisions of the Department of the Interior, together

with certain court cases which have been adjudicated, it has become almost impossible for anyone who is dealing in oil leases or options to find out whether he has a valid and existing lease or option. In other words, he cannot have a valid and existing lease or option unless the original lease was issued legally. So these questions have been raised, and, I desire to make the record clear. I do not think anyone objects to doing away with the difference between oil leases and options, and treating them alike under the law.

The question has been asked: Then, if the Congress approves the present bill, we will have achieved this result: in Alaska, oil companies operating there will be permitted to hold 600,000 Federal acres under lease; in all of the other States, the companies operating there will be limited to holding of 46,080 acres under lease?

This will be true unless the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee acts favorably and Congress then acts favorably upon and the President signs the bill now pending before the committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it proposed to lift the 46,080 limitation in the several States solely because the bill grants 600,000 acres in Alaska? Is it because the 600,000 acres leasehold grant is so large that the Senator from Colorado feels the disproportion makes mandatory the lifting in the other States of the acreage limitation?

Mr. ALLOTT. I should have to answer that in all fairness with a categorical "No." That is not the reason, I am sure, for considering the proposed legislation.

At the present time in public land States one can hold 46,080 acres by lease or direct holding and 200,000 acres by option, which makes a total holding by an individual or corporation of 246,080 acres. The reason for the figure 600,000 is not because the figures for the States have been raised, or it is contemplated they will be raised. I think the reason, which the Senator from Alaska may develop as he sees fit, is that it is felt that the size and area of Alaska warrants a larger acreage.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. In this connection I should like to note, for the information of the Senator from Ohio, that on page 2 the report reveals that the disparity between the holdings in Alaska and the other States is not so great really as it might first appear to be, because, as the Senator from Colorado noted, 246,080 acres may be held in the other States by lease and option, and additional land may be had under the Acquired Lands Act. There are not any acquired lands in Alaska. To all intents and purposes the act does not apply there. So in the State of Wyoming, which happens to be the example used in the report, there might be under the control of one individual or one corporation as much as 492,160 acres of land, or only 107,840 less than is requested in the pending measure for an area which has five times the land area of Wyoming. I think that is a very important point in this connection.

Mr. ALLOTT. I submit to the Senator, however, that though that is a possibility, it would rarely occur.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. It would be very rare.

Mr. BARTLETT. But as a matter of fact it is legally possible in any case.

Mr. ALLOTT. There are other legal possibilities which I intend to explore later, but that is the real ground and basis why I am not in favor of the pending bill.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me inquire whether the Senator from Colorado is a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes, I am.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from Colorado of the opinion that the provision which will allow the granting of a lease for 600,000 acres is sound?

Mr. ALLOTT. Not in the form in which that provision is set forth in this measure. After I have discussed the other features of the statutory background, I shall deal with that point.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Very well.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, some have asked how the committee justifies proposed legislative action which would permit oil companies which happen to operate in Alaska to hold under lease nearly 15 times the acreage which can be held under lease in the other States.

The committee's justification is set forth in its report on the bill. Briefly, the situation is that Alaska is large, and exploration and development costs there are high, as much as three times as great as the average cost in the other States. The initial investment is thus such that it must be protected by substantial acreage holdings.

At the present time, a number of operators in Alaska have reached their acreage limitation; and it is said that unless this measure is enacted, further pioneering work by these more active companies and persons must come to a halt. That is the argument that is made. It is stated that such a halt in their operations would "seriously retard" the search for and the development of Alaska's oil potential "to the grave detriment of both the economy of the State and our security in the nearest-to-Russia area under the American flag."

In addition, the long-range benefit would be the development of a thriving petroleum industry. The short-range benefit would be that many millions of dollars in badly needed additional revenues would go to Alaska, through her 90 per centum share of lease-rental revenues; roads would be built in remote places; and service industries would be attracted to Alaska. It is also said the Federal Treasury would benefit; and that national defense and security would be strengthened.

But the Department of the Interior is opposed to this bill.

Inasmuch as one of my chief purposes is to make the RECORD crystal clear in regard to the pending proposal, I wonder whether my colleague on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], will be willing to answer some questions in regard to how he understands the bill will operate and what its effect will be.

First of all, I am sure he will agree with me that the Department of the Interior is the agency which is designated by Congress to administer the leasing and development program for oil and gas resources on the public lands.

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Next, I am sure the Senator from Alaska will also agree with me that the primary purpose of this measure, regardless of whether it is explicitly stated—and this is probably where the Senator from Alaska and I are in disagreement—should be, not to bring immediate revenues into the coffers of the State of Alaska, but, rather, to secure the maximum overall development of the oil and gas resources of Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I think the bill might be said to have both purposes. The bill aims to attract the investment of capital and to promote oil and gas exploration under the extremely difficult and costly conditions which exist in Alaska.

Mr. ALLOTT. But is it not a fact that the overall development and the long-term development of these resources should be the purpose of this bill, rather than the immediate financial benefit which may be obtained by Alaska?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes, I think the long-range benefits might be the more important; but I think that both the long-range benefits and the short-range benefits may be considered as objectives.

Mr. ALLOTT. As a matter of fact, the original leasing act is entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," rather than "An act to bring more money into the individual States."

The Bureau of Land Management, of the Department of the Interior, is the agency which is responsible for administering the leases; and the Geological Survey, of the Department of the Interior, is responsible for supervising the actual development under the leases, and is charged with responsibility for insuring that sound conservation practices in compliance with applicable laws and regulations are followed. Are not these two agencies experienced in these activities? Furthermore, does the Senator from Alaska know how many leases these agencies are administering and supervising?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes, they are experienced along these lines; but we also find within the same Department profound differences of opinion. There were differences of opinion there in regard to this very bill. The Bureau of Land Management had one opinion, and a less

identifiable agency within the same Department had another opinion.

Mr. ALLOTT. But neither of those agencies gave its approval to the bill which now is before the Senate, did it?

Mr. GRUENING. I would not say that, because the reports were not made separately. When the Department made its report—which was in rather vague terms—it expressed disapproval of enactment of the million-acre provision, but added that if additional evidence were adduced, it would be prepared to change its mind. It made that report before the hearings were held; and a great deal of additional evidence was adduced at the hearings.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is the Senator from Alaska saying that now either the Department of the Interior or the U.S. Geological Survey supports the pending bill?

Mr. GRUENING. I am saying that the Department of the Interior is supporting a bill which is so little different from this one that I do not consider the difference essential.

Mr. ALLOTT. Since this is the Senator's bill, may I ask why there is not a report from the Department, then, saying that it approves this bill?

Mr. GRUENING. I cannot speak for the Department; but I know that it has agreed to approve a total leasing of 600,000 acres, provided it is divided into two parts—300,000 acres north of the Brooks Range, and 300,000 acres south of the Brooks Range, the total amount being the same as in this bill.

Those of us who are very much more familiar with conditions in Alaska than are the bureaucrats in the Department of the Interior know that that distinction is wholly unrealistic, and is not based on any actual justification as regards climatic or weather conditions upon which the Interior Department's distinction was supposedly based.

Mr. ALLOTT. I hope that if and when there is a change in the administration—although I trust I shall never see that day come—the Senator from Alaska will not apply the same epithet he has just now applied.

I wish to say that presently there are considerably more than 130,000 oil and gas leases in effect, and they embrace more than 107 million acres of land. Of course these two agencies have more than 39 years of experience under the Mineral Leasing Act.

Mr. GRUENING. If the Senator from Colorado will pardon me, let me say that I dislike to indulge in any self-advertising; but if the Senator from Colorado will consult my book entitled "The State of Alaska," he will find in it no less caustic indictments of the bureaucracy of administrations of different political complexion. I find that that bureaucracy does not change a great deal with the change of administrations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is it not true that in its report, the Department of the Interior recognizes that the development of oil and gas in Alaska continues to be more costly than in other States; but the Department does not believe that a general increase of the acreage limitation, as proposed by means of Senate bill 1855—namely, an increase of 600,000 acres—would be helpful or desirable? Is not that the substance of the report made by the Department of the Interior?

Mr. GRUENING. As I have stated, the Department of the Interior has agreed to an increase to 600,000 acres, provided the 600,000 acres is divided into two parts: 300,000 acres north of the Brooks Range, and 300,000 acres south of the Brooks Range. Those of us who sponsor this bill think that is a wholly arbitrary and unrealistic division and really does not apply sensibly to actual conditions in Alaska.

The reason for that distinction is, I think, that the Department of the Interior wished to develop exploration north of Brooks Range, on the assumption, as its witnesses testified, that weather conditions are far more severe north of the Brooks Range than they are south of it. Those of us who have been over that region on various occasions in various seasons, which the Department of the Interior experts have not been, know that climatic conditions south of Brooks Range are generally as severe as those north of Brooks Range. Colder temperatures, in fact, have been noted south of the Brooks Range than north of it. More snow actually falls south of Brooks Range than north of it.

So far as accessibility is concerned, neither of these oil-bearing regions is served appreciably by roads, so there is really no essential difference between the two areas, and the distinction made by the Department of the Interior is wholly unrealistic.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is it not a fact that the area north of Brooks Range was not opened up to leasing until some of the companies were close to the maximum of their lease holdings?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes. I think the Senator refers to the naval petroleum reserves.

Mr. ALLOTT. That area has only recently been opened up to leasing. Is that correct?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Department's report points out why it favors use by companies up to their limit of development contracts or unit plans. It is convinced that procedures which compel early and timely drilling to discovery and production are ideally designed to meet the present Alaska situation.

We are talking about a 600,000 acre limitation, which does away with the differentiation between the holding of options and leases under this bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is a fact, is it not, that under the bill before the Senate today, a company can hold almost limitless acreage in Alaska? In other words, by means of unitization of its lease and option contracts, and by utilizing development contracts, acreage of a company can be exempted from chargeability under the limitations of the act. Is that statement correct?

Mr. GRUENING. If the Senator so affirms I am sure that is so.

Mr. ALLOTT. I believe the Senator will find that it is true.

Mr. GRUENING. If the Senator from Colorado states it as a fact, I shall be happy to accept the statement.

Mr. ALLOTT. I see present on the floor the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. GRUENING. He is an expert on this subject.

Mr. ALLOTT. He participated in the hearings. I am sure he will bear me out in this statement: The fact is that even the 600,000-acre limitation under this bill does not represent any real limitation of holdings, because a company could hold 600,000 acres of land under lease and option. It could then unitize 50,000 acres and put that land into a unitization agreement which would call for a drilling contract under the agreement which the United States Geological Survey provides, but those 50,000 acres would then be subtracted from the amount chargeable to that company, and the company could then lease 50,000 more acres from the Federal Government. I ask the Senator from New Mexico if that is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. The statement made by the Senator from Colorado is correct, I am sure.

Mr. ALLOTT. The company could, in turn, take another 50,000 acres, set that land aside in a unitization agreement, and then it could substitute another 50,000 acres. By that time, the amount would be up to 700,000 acres. The company could do it again, take another 50,000 acres, put that land into a unitization agreement, and then lease another 50,000 acres. By that time the amount would be up to 750,000 acres.

Is it not true that by the use of a unitization agreement and by a development contract, there is no limitation upon what any one person or one firm may hold in Alaska or any other State?

Mr. GRUENING. There may be a legal limitation or not, but I should think there would be a limitation brought about by some circumstances.

Mr. ALLOTT. There would be some economic limitation, there is no question; but I think the Senator will find that in the hearings a statement was made, which was not challenged by anyone, that there is one company in Alaska today which controls more than 800,000 acres, and has drilled only two wells to date.

Mr. GRUENING. I think it must be realized that exploration and drilling in Alaska have been of very recent date, and the fact that this company has drilled two wells only means that exploration there is in its infancy.

Mr. ALLOTT. But in spite of the fact that the present limitation is 300,000 acres, here is a company that controls more than 800,000 acres, but has drilled only two wells. So this limitation by itself is not definitive. I will ask the Senator if that statement is not true. He has studied the bill. He has sponsored a similar bill. I am sure it is true that there is no practical limitation, so long as a company can put other acreage into unitization agreements and into development contracts.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator imply that this is a situation peculiar to Alaska?

Mr. ALLOTT. It applies to other places also, but this is a point which is not understood generally, and it is one of the reasons why I am deeply concerned about this bill. We are operating under a 300,000-acre limitation today, and one company already controls and owns acreage in excess of 800,000 acres. What is going to be the result if the limitation is increased to 600,000? Is that company going to jump its control up to 1,200,000 or 1,500,000 acres?

Mr. GRUENING. Nobody can foretell, but I am confident that if it does, it will mean greater development of oil resources in Alaska, which is what we are after.

Mr. ALLOTT. Merely because a company leases, there is no assurance, I point out to my friend, of the devolpment of oil in Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. We have no assurance about many things. We are hopeful oil development will occur. That is the purpose of this bill. Such legislation has the support of all those who are really familiar with Alaska and with oil conditions and prospects there.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the Senator is taking in a little too much territory when he makes that statement, because I think there are many persons, as well as industries, acquainted with the situation, that are not sure this would be a good piece of legislation.

Mr. GRUENING. If that be true, why did not those opponents appear at the well-advertised hearings? No opposition was heard from any source except the rather ambiguous comment by the Department of the Interior. It was the only opposition which was registered.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Department of the Interior is, after all, the department of Government which is chargeable with this particular responsibility. Both the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Geological Survey appeared in opposition to the bill as did the Department of the Interior.

Mr. GRUENING. I am sorry, but I have to disagree with the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. They have offices in Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. The Bureau of Land Management did not appear in opposition. In fact, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, as is shown in the record of hearings, stated he thought the present acreage limitation was unrealistic and should be increased.

Mr. ALLOTT. But that does not mean he is in support of the bill which the Senator is espousing today.

Mr. GRUENING. No. He has to take orders, as most bureaucrats do from higher bureaucrats.

Let me read from the record of hearings of June 19.

Mr. ALLOTT. To what page is the Senator referring, please?

Mr. GRUENING. Page 10 of the hearings on Alaska Mineral Leasing:

On June 5, Senator O'MAHONEY, who is the chairman of this subcommittee, was questioning Mr. Woozley, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, on the subject of acreage limitation, and Senator O'MAHONEY said:

"What do you think about the amount of land that should be carried under options and leases. Do you have in mind a maximum limitation?"

And Mr. Woozley, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of Interior, replied:

"I think, Senator, that as far as the States other than Alaska are concerned, the present limitation has proved satisfactory, the 46,080 and the other making a total of 246,000. I am not so sure that with the present acreage available in Alaska that the present option is realistic."

Senator O'MAHONEY then said:

"As a matter of fact, you think it probably is not realistic."

Mr. Woozley said, "That is true. I think with the tremendous acreage involved in Alaska there probably should be some realinement for that."

Mr. ALLOTT. I point out to the Senator again, that is far from an endorsement of the bill. It is a request for realinement.

Mr. GRUENING. Neither, as the distinguished Senator has contended, is the view expressed in opposition to the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. There is a report, because the Department of Interior, which is the Department in which the Bureau of Land Management is contained, has filed an adverse report on the bill and has appeared in opposition to the bill.

Mr. GRUENING. Of course, the Department of Interior is far from infallible. Those who have observed its workings through the years have seen it commit some very grievous errors. The Department prevented for a decade and a half the mining of coal in Alaska, so that the development of Alaska was seriously retarded for practically half a generation. We have seen such things happen again and again.

In the report which was made as to the reasons for the opposition and the reasons for the counterproposal made, it is stated the witnesses had no firsthand knowledge of the situation which they described. But all the people of Alaska who have had firsthand knowledge—the commissioner of resources of Alaska and others who have been on the ground—knew the facts to be different from what the Department of Interior asserted them to be or believed them to be.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to ask the Senator a question. Is it not true that under the proposed legislation an oil company can hold 600,000 acres-plus, at an average rental for the first 5 years of 20 cents an acre a year?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes, I think that is correct. It is 20 cents. Of course, some people have been critical of that and have sought to increase the amount, but I do not think that is particularly pertinent to the bill under consideration.

Mr. ALLOTT. So if we permit oil companies to hold such fantastic acreages without any obligation to drill, for the cheap cost of 20 cents an acre, we will not be contributing to the development of Alaska's resources. We would contribute to the immediate rentals, 90 percent of which would go to the State.

I am not trying to penalize our good friends from the State of Alaska, but by such action we would not contribute to the development of the oil and gas of Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I beg to differ with the Senator. Of course, the Senator is entitled to his opinion, and it is based on a good deal of experience, but there are others who disagree, and I am one of them.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator has spoken often of his experience in Alaska. I might point out to the Senator, since I live in the Great Plains area of the United States, where there is much oil and gas produced, I, too, have had a little experience in this field. I find that the mere taking of leases does not contribute to development. So long as the companies concerned can hold the leases at a minimum rental, they often retain them as reserves. They will pay for the leases rather than develop the lands. That is what I think would be accomplished in Alaska under the provisions of the Senator's bill.

Mr. GRUENING. I am glad the Senator has stated that for the RECORD, because it will give us every inducement to persuade these companies to do otherwise—to develop, as I am confident they will.

Mr. ALLOTT. I will ask the Senator how many wildcat wells have been drilled in Alaska to date.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I believe the drilling of the first wildcat well is about to start.

Mr. ALLOTT. So with the present 300,000-acre limitation and the leasing of land on Kenai Peninsula and elsewhere, only one wildcat well to date has been drilled. Is that correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. No. My understanding, which may not be technically accurate, because I am not an oil expert, is that the wildcat well is to be drilled. A well was drilled on Kenai Peninsula by Richfield and Standard, and oil was discovered there. Another well was drilled and oil was also discovered, but all experiences have not been so fortunate.

There are many tales told, of course, in the Land of the Midnight Sun. In respect to separating fancy from fact, the job is not always easy. It is said that Phillips Petroleum in the Yakataga region spent in excess of $8 million without making any discovery at all.

If the Senator will permit me to add one more statement on the Alaska Peninsula, Humble Oil Co. is reputed to have spent more for one well, which produced absolutely nothing, than the United States paid for Alaska to Russia in 1867, when the price was $7.2 million.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would have to say that I do not follow the Senator's reasoning.

I should like to ask my friend another question. Is it not a fact that all the wells which have been drilled in Alaska so far, except one, have been under development contracts?

Mr. BARTLETT. I cannot answer the Senator.

Mr. GRUENING. There have not been so many as to prove the rule, I believe. I think there have been two.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator thinks possibly there have been two?

Mr. GRUENING. I think there have been two, yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Let us concede there have been two. The development contracts are not chargeable to the acreage which the companies have charged to them, are they?

Mr. GRUENING. I do not see the pertinence of the question.

Mr. ALLOTT. It goes to the pertinency of the matter, I will say to my friend, in this way: If a company can keep on enlarging its acreage by the use of developmental contracts and by the use of unitization, then the 600,000 acres as a limitation, which is being sought by the bill, which would not guarantee any geographical distribution of development, would permit the companies to continue to grow until there was a complete monopoly of all the possible oil land and oil and gas land in the southern part of the State. On the other hand, if a company must commit acreage to a development or unitization contract it becomes obligated to drill and develop the area. This bill tends to reduce the existing incentives for going into development and unitization contracts.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is, of course, a very interesting theory; indeed, it may be more than that—it may be a fact. However, it seems to me what can be done in Alaska under the existing law is exactly that which can be done in any other State. The law which applies to Alaska with respect to leases and unitization is no different from the law which applies to Colorado or Wyoming. If there is something wrong with the general law, let us cure it. If there is something wrong with the rental structure for leases, let us cure that generally.

However, we are discussing a case where theoretically, at least, in any one of the States, taking into consideration the Acquired Lands Act, a person or a company may have almost as much oil and gas land as is proposed in this measure under consideration.

Mr. ALLOTT. He could, if there were that much acquired land in any State.

Mr. BARTLETT. Theoretically, as I stated.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is a very theoretical case that a person could do so. Even granting that this is the situation in a given State, the point I am making is: If a company can now hold or control in excess of 800,000 acres, with a 300,000-acre limitation, how much can the company own or control with a 600,000-acre limitation?

Mr. BARTLETT. More, I suppose; but this can be done elsewhere. The other day we were holding a hearing before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In response to a question I asked, a witness for the Interior Department said that by the stroke of a pen the Secretary of the Interior could turn all the public domain of Alaska into a wildlife range. So we cannot exactly predict what will happen in any given situation.

Mr. ALLOTT. I predict that Alaska will be like every other State. In some areas there will be oil and gas, and in other areas there will not be.

The Senator has answered my question. There would be no real limitation, with the proposed increase in the amount of acreage which may be held.

I should like to ask my friend from Alaska one further question. Does he favor a change in the rental rates for oil and gas leases on the public domain, to bring them more in line with the rentals which anyone would have to pay to lease land from a private individual?

Mr. GRUENING. I believe that if that would be productive of more revenue, and would not inhibit oil development, I would be in favor of it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Does the Senator believe that it would inhibit oil development?

Mr. GRUENING. That I cannot tell.

Mr. ALLOTT. Does he think it would produce more or less revenue?

Mr. GRUENING. We can never know until we try it, whether an increase in price limits the use, or whether the lessees absorb the increase and go ahead. I do not think we can tell until we actually try it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Does the Senator say he is in favor of the position discussed in committee by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], with respect to the increase of these rentals, or is he opposed to it?

Mr. GRUENING. I think the Senator from New Mexico was on sound ground when he pointed out that the price of everything else had gone up since the days when these rentals were fixed at very low figures, and that there was no reason why the price of the rentals should not go up.

Mr. ALLOTT. Does the Senator believe that rentals should be subject to adjustment?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. May I inquire whether the Senator has in mind offering an amendment to the pending bill to increase the rentals in Alaska?

Mr. GRUENING. No; I have not.

Mr. ALLOTT. But the Senator does favor it?

Mr. GRUENING. I do not believe we should complicate this relatively simple issue by offering amendments which might be highly controversial.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

Third. Whatever else may be said of S. 1855, it is piecemeal legislation of the worst sort.

H.R. 6940 deals only with Alaska. It would establish acreage limitation, insofar as direct or lease holdings are involved—and these are the significant holdings—15 times those permitted in the other States.

On this point, it is obvious that by dealing only with Alaska, H.R. 6940 places companies presently operating exclusively in Alaska or in Alaska and the other States, in a discriminatorily favored position over those companies operating solely in States other than Alaska.

It would eliminate the distinction between lease and option holdings, a major policy decision in itself, but only in Alaska; at the same time, it would totally ignore other clearly, and even vitally, interrelated proposals.

There are pending in the Congress perhaps the most numerous and significant proposed amendments to the Mineral Leasing Act in its history. Many of these are, in the view of industry, the committee, and the Department of the Interior, meritorious proposals. But —and this is the important thing—Interior has repeatedly emphasized its absolute conviction that these several important and interrelated legislative elements should be considered together, or if considered separately should be considered in such order as would achieve the same effect as a single bill combining all elements, that is, repeal of second- and third-year rental waiver; adjustment upward of present minimum lease rentals; elimination of distinction between lease and option holdings, with consequent substantial increase in permissible direct acreage holdings in each State; and, then increasing of the primary lease term to 10 years from 5 years.

H.R. 6940 is proposed for action by the Senate without any assurance whatsoever that consideration can and will be given to adjusting by statute present law governing the second- and third-year waiver, lease rentals, or lease terms.

Fourth. H.R. 6940 threatens to deprive both the people of the United States and the people of Alaska of very substantial revenues.

Viewed most conservatively, and not very realistically, H.R. 6940 would double the present acreage limitation in Alaska: it would increase total allowable acreage from 300,000 acres—100,000 under lease, 200,000 under option—to 600,000 acres however held. Viewed realistically, it would multiply by six times the acreage limitation in Alaska—increasing it from the present 100,000 acres permitted under lease to 600,000 under lease.

Having in mind the present average of 20 cents per acre per year rental chargeable during the 5-year primary lease term provided under present law, we can assume conservatively that that lease acreage would double in Alaska as a result of enactment of H.R. 6940. Then, let us examine the consequences.

Examination of the record made, and some reexamination of statistics, make it clear that the statements appearing at page 4 of the committee report—"the need for this additional revenue, which can be realized at no cost to the Federal Treasury, and the Federal Treasury would in fact benefit"—are, put succinctly, completely misleading and erronous.

Presently under lease or lease offer are some 46 million acres in Alaska. On the basis of the committee's advice and the position of Senator GRUENING, the bill's sponsor, we may assume that acreage would double in the near future—would climb to 96 million acres.

This being the case, enactment now of H.R. 6940 would invite a result we cannot believe—on close examination—would be either in the interest of the new State of Alaska and its people, or the people of the United States.

Enactment of H.R. 6940, without an attendant change in the present waiver or rental provisions—and the bill's sponsor indicated no enthusiasm whatsoever for such changes in H.R. 6940, notwithstanding urging by the Department of the Interior—the Government would, of course, be bound by the terms of leases as they would issue under present law at an average of 20 cents an acre for the first 5 years.

Gross rental for the initial 5-year term, as we have said is $1 per acre; of this Alaska receives 90 percent, the United States 10 percent. Assuming doubling of acreage presently under lease as a result of relaxation of acreage limitations, enactment of Senator GRUENING's bill now would deprive the new State of Alaska of at least $81,800,000 in oil and gas leasing revenues in the next 5 years.

In other words, if we enact the proposed legislation now, and people take up 5-year leases based upon the estimated expansion of the lease law, it will deprive the State of Alaska of at least $81,800,000 in revenues in the next 5 years, because the present rate of rentals will apply. The difference between 90 percent of rentals at $3 gross rental per acre on the same number of acres if issuance of leases were made under recommended increased minimum rentals.

If the rates of lease were raised, as we have proposed, instead of bringing in $1 in the first 5 years, it would bring in $3; but if this occurred, and if the acreage did double—and I am sure my friends from Alaska anticipate that it would—the resulting loss to Alaska would be as I have indicated.

This we call keepaway of moneys belonging to Alaska for schools, roads, and such other purposes as the legislature decides.

It follows that the loss of revenues to the United States would be $9,200,000 during the same period, and for the same reasons.

This we call giveaway, of moneys belonging to all of the people of the United States.

For reasons we have elsewhere pointed out, this deprivation of very, very substantial revenues would occur without any attendant assurance that early and timely development of lands would occur. This we call takeaway—of millions of acres of land from development possibilities, for a number of years, at bargain basement rates, by a handful of oil companies which happen to be operating in Alaska at the present time.

But even those figures need not be the full ultimate loss to either Alaska or the United States by reason of enactment of H.R. 6940.

If H.R. 6940 is enacted now, and if subsequently the primary lease term is increased from 5 to 10 years—and S. 2181 and other pending bills propose such a change—without attendant adjustments for the full period of minimum rentals and without repeal of the present rental waiver provisions—and the legislation presently pending in committee makes no such provisions—the loss in revenues will climb appreciably.

Present gross rentals for 10 years aggregate $3.50 per acre; as Interior proposes to change existing law the new gross minimum rental would be $8 per acre. Under these circumstances the loss of revenues to the State of Alaska because of increased leasing activity as a result of relaxed acreage limitations—and without attendant adjustments the Interior Department argued unsuccessfully should be made—would amount to at least $186,300,000 over the 10-year period. The difference between 90 percent of rentals at $3.50 gross per acre on 46 million acres under present law, and 90 percent of rentals at the Departments' proposed $8 gross per acre for the 10-year period.

And this is not all. To the foregoing would have to be added loss of revenue during the 6th through the 10th years on the 46 million acres' worth of leases presently outstanding or on application, or an additional $103,500,000. The difference between 90 percent of rentals at $2.50 gross per acre on 46 million acres under present law, and 90 percent of rentals at $5 gross per acre for the 6th through the 10th years.

The total loss of revenue to Alaska over the 10-year period following the enactment of H.R. 6940 might well be as high as $289,800, and to the people of the United States, during the same period, almost $30 million. H.R. 6940 could provide a loss of a third of a billion dollars in revenue, I believe, to the State of Alaska. It is give away, take away, and keep away.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. If the calamity which the Senator from Colorado visualizes were to take place under the provision of the bill, a proposal to extend the acreage to 600,000, would there not be a corresponding calamity in the Department of the Interior's recommendation also to grant 600,000 acres, to be divided merely by a geographic line? Obviously the same result would obtain in either case.

Mr. ALLOTT. Not at all. As a matter of fact, the recommendation of the Department of the Interior would tend to spread this acreage over the entire State of Alaska, so that we would get what the original Mineral Leasing Act contemplated, which is the maximum development of lands in the State of Alaska.

I do not believe that it can be successfully contended that if we pass a bill increasing the acreage limitation now, and then do not act immediately—and we should act before we pass this law—to increase the rentals, we will deprive the State of Alaska of many millions of dollars of State revenue, and we will also deprive the U.S. Government of a similar amount.

In the first paragraph of page 4 of the committee report, it is stated:

> The need for this additional revenue, which can be realized at no cost to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. President, this is not at no cost to the Federal Treasury, and I think it is not at no cost to the State of Alaska. I think the State of Alaska will pay dearly for this, unless it is coupled with an increase in the price and cost of acreage rentals.

Finally, this proposal is premature. Apart from the very real threat of loss of very substantial revenues, through the enactment of H.R. 6940, the longer range loss risk might be even greater; that is, the risk that development would be slowed through the inaction of leaseholders in Alaska for from 5 to 10 years.

The Department of the Interior puts it this way: Concede, arguendo, that the Department of the Interior is in error in its judgment that development contracts and unit agreements appear to be the best or only way to assure full and timely development in Alaska in the immediate future, that is, the next year or the next 18 months; concede further that the past 2 years' history of nondevelopment on acreage other than that embraced by such agreements is misleading, and that subsequent history will so demonstrate. If the Department of the Interior is wrong in pleading for caution now, its "error" can be undone next year, or the year following, with some minimal slowdown of development in Alaska.

If, on the other hand, the proponent of H.R. 6940 is in error in his assertion—and I believe he is—that relaxation of the acreage limitation at this time is unwarranted, as the Department's experts think he is, or in any case that his present judgment is unwarranted based on past showings, and therefore premature, that error could not be undone for upwards of 10 years. Why? Because the lessee companies could have their acreage and not need to develop it for that long a period. Both revenues and development would be lost.

There is one other reason for labeling action now "premature." Under the Alaska Statehood Act, the State is authorized to select more than 100 million acres of lands. Lands prospectively valuable for oil and gas could be selected. If Alaskans truly feel they want to risk increased acreage on the lands of individuals and companies now, they need only proceed to select. Alaska law permits 500,000-acre holdings on fast lands by one individual, 500,000 on submerged lands. The new State ought to examine its own position and in good faith do something on its own to relieve what the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] describes as a "grave detriment" situation. Thus far, no sign of willingness so to act has been evidenced.

In short, Alaska has a clear remedy for the illness which the junior Senator from Alaska asserts plagues her.

I have only the utmost respect for the junior Senator from Alaska, and I have only the utmost respect for his intentions in this matter. I desire to make it clear that nothing I have said should be construed by anyone to imply anything except that the Senator from Alaska is trying to do for his State what he thinks at the present moment is best for it. I have tried to convince him, unsuccessfully, twice—in the subcommittee and also in the full committee—that this proposal is not in the best interests of Alaska. I hope he will reconsider his position.

The interests of Alaska would appear to be on the side of deferring action on H.R. 6940, even though some Alaskans might want to risk depriving themselves

both of substantial revenues and development of her resources. Congress cannot so lightly risk the interests of all the people of the United States in those same resources.

The proposal of the Secretary of the Interior was that the acreage limitation contained in H.R. 6940 be split, so that 300,000 acres would be south of the Brooks Range, and 300,000 would be north. The reason for splitting the acreage, according to the Department's reasoning—and this is also included in the reports of the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey—is that it would assure development not only north of Brooks Range, but also south of Brooks Range. To put it another way, it would assure development not only in the south, where the major portion of the development is now taking place, but would also assure development north of Brooks Range, where little or no oil and gas exploration work is being conducted.

As it is, the bill if passed would permit all this development to be done in the very south of Alaska, and would leave what is generally regarded as perhaps the best possible development area of Alaska, which is north of the Brooks Range, without any development, or with no impetus to begin development.

I have pointed out that if the bill is enacted now, those who lease will secure what amounts to 10-year leases on very, very reduced minimal acreage fees. I say in all candor that what should be done is not to pass the bill. If the bill is passed, there will be a rush to lease at the cheap rate of 20 cents an acre a year; and once those leases have been made, they can be renewed at the end of 5 years for a period of 10 years. There will be no guarantee at all that any development work will be done.

Furthermore, there will be a great loss of revenue. I cannot help feeling that in the long run Alaska will be many, many million dollars ahead if we defer action on this bill until such time as action has been taken on the proposals to increase the rental rates. At that time the Senator from Alaska could reintroduce his bill.

I have one other objection to the bill. As I pointed out at some length a while ago, under present law one company holds in excess of 800,000 acres of land. I have been informed that wells have been drilled, at least commenced, to entitle them to hold these 800,000 acres. If we increase the maximum to 600,000 acres without making them expand into other areas, I do not know how much land any one company could hold in Alaska.

I do not hold with this policy of government. I believe that the limitation carried in the bill will lead to headaches. It may even, in this administration or subsequent administrations, lead to scandal, because it involves the control of entirely too much land without the impelling duty to spread this interest over the State of Alaska.

I do not want to see this administration or any other administration imposed with the impossibility of administering such an impossible law, and in my opinion if we do what is projected, we will be acting to the ultimate detriment of Alaska and the United States in several different ways.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Naturally in a situation similar to the present one, even in different situations, men of honest convictions may differ. I cannot let the debate on this bill conclude, though, without noting that my colleague [Mr. GRUENING] and I introduced the bill at the specific request of the State Legislature of Alaska. Nor do I want the debate to fail to note that the director of natural resources of Alaska, Phil Holdsworth, urged passage of the bill.

It is our belief and conviction that instead of taking money from the State of Alaska, enactment of the bill will create a situation which will add to State revenues.

We are, of course, vitally interested in receiving into our State treasury the rental revenues which are so meaningful now in adding to the credit side of the State treasury, but even more important is the development of an oil industry which will give us royalty proceeds, and could by itself come close to maintaining the cost of the governmental operation of the State of Alaska.

We would expect that the dedicated employees of the Interior Department would prevent scandal from occurring even if the acreage limitation were double what it proposed under this bill. I think they could watch over it very carefully and make sure that nothing untoward occurred.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator realizes, of course, that under the present law, one which we are trying to correct by S. 2181, which is now pending before the committee, the Department of the Interior has experienced difficulty in controlling the number of leases and options.

I am sure the Senator is aware of that, and it is for that reason and in this area that assistance is sought so we may not have a scandal, or bring about such a situation that many innocent people may be hurt, because under the present law the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey have no really adequate way to control the transfer of leases by way of assignment so that innocent purchasers can ascertain what they are.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the Senator know whether the Department of the Interior has requested Congress to alter this situation?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes; they have.

Mr. BARTLETT. When did that request first come?

Mr. ALLOTT. I cannot say when it first came. I can only say to the Senator that they have requested us to alter it, and the remedy is contained in S. 2181.

Mr. BARTLETT. This situation has been in effect for a long period of time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Since the beginning of the Mineral Leasing Act; and it should have been corrected many years ago.

Mr. BARTLETT. Have many scandals occurred?

Mr. ALLOTT. No scandals have occurred, but many people have suffered many, many thousands of dollars of loss because of it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I may say to the Senator from Colorado that, though I disagree with him as to his conclusions relating to the bill, I think he has performed a useful public service in calling to the attention of the Senate his objections. However, I should like to speak for a moment on another feature.

Mr. ALLOTT. Before the Senator turns to that, let me say to him that I have been a lawyer all my life, and I sometimes argue very vehemently and very seriously. I am sure that he and his colleague know, and I hope they will always know, that what I have to say about this bill indicates no reflection on the intent and the honesty of either of the Senators from Alaska. I have stated before, and I reiterate, my deep regard for both Senators and for what they are trying to do, but there are some conclusions which seem to me patent, which I cannot avoid, and therefore I feel obligated to call them to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did wish to point out that oil development north of the Brooks Range might be made difficult by reason of the fact that practically all of that area remains withdrawn under public land order 82, and on very little of it may oil and gas leases be made. I think it is rather a striking illustration that the Colorado Oil & Gas Co. from the Senator's own State—I do not know whether it is "hurting" for land or whether it has too much land, or what its situation is in respect to land—has acquired by lease some land north of the Brooks Range in the so-called Gubik area where the Navy made a large gas discovery during the war, and this company, with fine enterprise, is looking forward to the possibility of transporting gas by pipeline from the Arctic to Fairbanks and possibly to the seacoast. We all wish them well because this would have much meaning in respect to the lowering of fuel costs in all of interior Alaska.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish them well, too, and I say with all sincerity to my two friends that I realize that in these beginning years of Alaska's statehood, Alaska has to find funds with which to operate, and that the first few years, more perhaps than any other time, are going to be very difficult.

I feel that the policy which would be approved by the bill is shortsighted. I would not say now that I would oppose it if the rental situation were different, but I feel that I must vote against the bill under the present situation.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I, too, wish to express my appreciation of the sincerity of the Senator from Colorado in his approach to the pending bill.

Of course, in the committee he expressed much less detailed views in regard to his concern about the provisions of the bill than he has expressed at great length and with new arguments on the

floor. I do not share the fears he has voiced. I believe he has constructed an imaginative picture of cumulative financial disaster; and when he refers to financial disaster resulting from enactment of the bill, I cannot agree with him. I do not believe there will be scandals as a result of the 600,000-acre provision of the bill. The Senator from Colorado seems to be of the opinion that scandals will develop under the 600,000-acre provision of the pending bill, but that no scandals would develop under the 600,000-acre provision proposed by the Department of the Interior. I cannot agree with the Senator from Colorado as to that; I cannot see such a difference between the two provisions.

Mr. ALLOTT. Certainly there is a difference between them; because the Department has recommended a separate limitation of 300,000 acres north of the Brooks Range and a separate limitation of 300,000 acres south of the Brooks Range.

Certainly it is not realistic for the Senator from Alaska to argue that, on the one hand, Alaska deserves special consideration because of her large area, and subsequently to argue that, on the other hand, the great size of Alaska should be ignored. The actual size of Alaska must be considered in connection with both matters.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I do not agree with the argument the Senator from Colorado has made; I believe he is mistaken.

On the other hand, I have high respect for the Senator from Colorado, who has had a great deal of experience in oil matters in the West, particularly in Colorado, although it should be realized by all that conditions in Colorado are very different from those in Alaska.

In any event, Mr. President, I desire to express my great personal regard for the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to pass the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

THE FARM PROBLEM IN LIGHT OF THE LETTER FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Was the Senator from Louisiana recognized?

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe I was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has been recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during his weekly press conference a few weeks ago, President Eisenhower expressed the hope that the Congress would enact a decent farm bill before adjournment. The President's comment, taken in conjunction with recent speeches made by Secretary of Agriculture Benson, indicated to me that perhaps the Chief Executive might not be aware of either the attitude of the Congress or the position of his own Department of Agriculture in connection with farm legislation thus far this year.

In response to the President's comment, I wrote him, on July 23, that as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I would give him my personal assurance that if he would supply the committee with a draft of legislation conforming to his own views—that is, in the form of specific proposals which he believed could be enacted by the Congress—it would receive expeditious and thorough consideration.

Yesterday, I received a letter from the President, in response to my letter of July 23.

To me, the most significant portion of the President's letter reads as follows:

> I trust that farm legislation, particularly with respect to wheat, can be favorably acted upon this year by your committee in a form that will prove to be acceptale to the Congress and in such form that I can approve consistently with the interests of all Americans.
>
> The Secretary of Agriculture will supply you with drafts of legislative language to effectuate my recommendation.

In this connection, two points are of paramount importance. First, the President apparently appreciates the fact that any farm legislation which has a chance of enactment must reflect, and be based upon, the will of Congress. Second, the President is evidently prepared to submit to the Congress specific, draft legislation on a straight-down-the-line basis. If that were done, it would be a marked departure from the course followed by the administration thus far this year.

At no time has the 86th Congress had before it a draft of legislation which purported to hew to the line of the President's views. Those views, as I read them, would require changes in all farm programs involving mandatory price supports covering all commodities except corn.

This is important, because earlier this year, the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to testify in support of the President's farm program recommendations. At that time, he outlined certain broad and general policies which he suggested be used as the basis for new legislation affecting only certain commodities. He did not submit at that time, nor had he previously submitted to the committee, draft legislation embodying his views on the President's views on a farm program.

The following excerpt from the hearing is pertinent:

> The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, have you any legislation that you have prepared to submit to the committee?
>
> Secretary BENSON. No, Mr. Chairman; we have not drafted any legislation; but we stand ready to help the committee in any way we can. We would be glad to help with the drafting if the committee would give us some directions as to what they would like to do. We would be happy to do that.

Later, counsel for the Department did submit legislative drafts to the committee staff; but in no instance, insofar as price supports were concerned, did such proposed legislation provide for a definite, comprehensive farm program. Despite the President's indication that all commodities subject to mandatory supports, except corn, should be dealt with in new legislation, draft proposals covering only three price-supported commodities were made available by the Department. Even these were phrased in the alternative. In the case of wheat, the Secretary suggested two routes to travel. The first alternative involved lower price supports and increased acreage. The other alternative involved a tightening of controls, lower price supports, and reduced acreage.

In the case of peanuts and tobacco, the same was true—that is, the Department offered for each of these commodities two alternative price-support proposals. In the case of peanuts, the proposal included authority to increase acreage allotments, issue marketing orders, and eventually substitute marketing orders for marketing quotas.

No legislation dealing with cotton or rice was proposed then, or has been proposed subsequently. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of Agriculture stated that in view of the enactment last year by the Congress of laws affecting primarily cotton, rice, and corn, it might be desirable to give that legislation a reasonable trial.

What action was taken on those suggestions, Mr. President?

All of the Secretary's recommendations were referred to appropriate subcommittees, at which time they received intensive hearings and study. As a result of those hearings and studies, the full committee acted. Separate bills, covering wheat and tobacco, were reported.

It is true that neither of those bills followed verbatim either of the price-support alternatives suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture. In fact, the wheat bill did not conform in all respects to the legislation proposed by other members of the committee, other Senators, or farm organizations. However, the wheat bill we approved, the same bill which was passed by the Senate, adopted in principle the second alternative relating to acreage controls recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture—that is, we voted to tighten restrictions, close loopholes, and offer the prospects of reducing wheat production by over 200 millions bushels per year.

In the meantime, the House Committee on Agriculture had also been holding hearings on proposed wheat legislation. That committee reported, and the House passed, a bill providing for price supports at 90 percent of parity and a reduction in acreage allotments of 25 percent, with a payment in kind on diverted acreage of one-third the average annual wheat yield.

In addition, the House measure also included many of the provisions of the Senate bill which provided for tightening of present laws and closing of loopholes.

The Senate and the House conferees met on June 16 and 17, and agreed upon a 2-year bill providing for price supports at 80 percent of parity, with a 20

percent reduction in acreage, and including provisions relating to the tightening or closing of loopholes in the law.

The conference report was approved by the Senate on June 17, but was rejected by the House by a vote of 215 to 202.

All of that was done, I might add, with the assistance of the administration. They marshaled their forces in the House to defeat the conference bill.

As a result, the Senate was compelled to adopt the House version of the wheat bill, which provided for price supports at 90 percent of parity, with a 25 percent reduction in acreage.

According to responsible estimates, this bill would have reduced production of wheat by some 300 million bushels per year and cut Goverment costs by an estimated $264 million per year.

This legislation was forwarded to the President on June 22, and was vetoed by him on June 25.

In the case of tobacco, the bill finally enacted followed the President's recommendation to the extent of providing price supports lower than would have been the case had we maintained the existing price support law unchanged. It was vetoed, as I understand it, partly because it sought to maintain the old parity concept as one basis for determining the support level, but principally because it might raise farmers' hopes. It would seem that, basically, the President vetoed a tobacco bill which, by his own estimate, would have saved the Government about $14 million the first year, and which provided for reduced support levels, because, even though it went in the direction he recommended, it did not go far enough.

The facts are, Mr. President, that the Congress has done its best to enact remedial farm legislation this year, but it has been frustrated in its efforts to do so by two vetoes.

Now, I do not want to indulge in blame laying, because the problems involved are much too serious to be dealt with on that basis. I do say, however, that we may be approaching a point where constructive farm legislation can become law, if the Congress receives drafts of bills of a type which have a chance of congressional approval, and I am willing to take the President at his word in this regard.

I do hope, however, that in drafting such legislation, the executive branch will not insist upon having everything its own way—that it will take into consideration the fact that the Congress has already expressed its will, but that we are willing to meet the executive branch in a spirit of conciliation and compromise if, indeed, the Secretary of Agriculture is willing to meet us in that same spirit.

I want to again assure the Chief Executive that if straightforward legislation, legislation which the Congress can find acceptable, is forwarded to us, I, as chairman, along with the entire membership of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, certainly propose to do everything possible to see that such legislation is readied for action without delay.

Mr. President, since preparing the remarks I have just delivered, I have received a letter from Secretary Benson transmitting to me proposed draft legislation to accomplish the President's views on a farm program. The Secretary's letter arrived at my office about 10:30 this morning.

As I indicated earlier, I had hoped that the President would fulfill his implied promise to me that farm legislation would be submitted which could be favorably acted upon this year by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and which would prove to be acceptable to the Congress.

Such, however, is obviously not the case. I am distressed to note that the draft bills that the Secretary of Agriculture forwarded to me this morning are verbatim, line for line, word for word, with the suggestions he presented to the committee beginning as far back as February, which were the subject of committee hearings, which were rejected by both the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, by the Congress as a whole, and which are not supported by any of the major farm organizations.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate the Senator for the presentation he is making this afternoon. For a long time I have felt that the attitude of the Department of Agriculture was not candid in its relationship with the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is chairman, and on which I have the honor to serve.

Yesterday I placed in the RECORD additional testimony which showed that the Secretary of Agriculture promised the committee last February that he would send us an omnibus farm bill, and I stated that as of now it is clear he has yet to fulfill that promise.

I ask my friend from Louisiana if, based on the correspondence to which he has just referred, it does not appear to him that the President believes the Department of Agriculture has actually done something in the way of proposing overall farm legislation, when in fact it has not. In other words, does it not appear that President Eisenhower believes Secretary Benson has sent to Congress an omnibus, overall farm bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Judging from the letter sent to me by the President, it seemed to me he was prepared to send to me, in response to my request, proposed legislation which, in the light of what Congress did last month and the month before, might have some chance of passage. I had hoped he would see that the Secretary of Agriculture forwarded new legislation, involving new thoughts, a new approach. I never dreamed that, in the light of the President's letter, the Secretary would merely have his earlier suggestions, covering only three crops, retyped and dispatched to me.

I might say further that, in my opinion, it is evident the President is not aware of the fact that the program for wheat, peanuts, and tobacco proposed by the Secretary earlier this year has been studied by both committees of the Congress and has been rejected. It is also evident, from reading the President's letter, that he may not be aware that Mr. Benson had not sent to Congress an omnibus bill designed to carry out his program, but, instead, merely sent alternative proposals covering only three commodities. Anybody who reads his letter, which I hope to put in the RECORD, will see that is true.

Furthermore, notwithstanding the fact that the President only a few days ago wrote me that he would see that the Secretary of Agriculture sent to Congress proposed farm legislation which had a chance of congressional approval, the Secretary has sent to Congress legislation which is essentially the same as one of the alternative suggestions sent to Congress last February.

As the Senator well knows, the committee held extended hearings on these schemes, and the only wheat bill that could be passed by the Senate was the one which was finally approved.

As the Senator will recall, when this bill went to conference, the conferees agreed to 80-percent-of-parity price supports, with a 20-percent cut in acreage allotments. The conference report was submitted to the Senate, and the Senate adopted it, but the House rejected it, at the instigation of the administration. In this connection, it is apparent that the administration which purports to be concerned about the wheat surplus, defeated a bill which would have curtailed wheat production by over 200 million bushels. As a result, the Senate, in order to deal with the wheat problem, was compelled to accept the House proposal, which, incidentally, would have reduced production substantially, too. I am the first to admit that this bill was far from perfect but it was the only legislation Congress could agree to, and it would have reduced production and made a start toward reducing the wheat surplus.

I am sure the President ought to be aware of the fact that the committees of Congress have done the best they could in presenting wheat legislation. I am sure the Senator will also agree with me that there is no chance at all of the Congress adopting the proposals submitted to us this morning by the Secretary of Agriculture, particularly since they have already been studied by both the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, and rejected.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield again, based on the letter from the President to the Senator from Louisiana and the subsequent letter of the Secretary of Agriculture to the Senator from Louisiana, the latter being dated August 3, am I correct in stating the Senator believes the President thinks the Secretary of Agriculture has done something, which actually, from the standpoint of any presentation of comprehensive legislation, the Secretary has not done.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The second paragraph of the letter of Secretary Benson dated August 3 states:

> It should be noted that this language is, in effect, an updating of the legislative language forwarded to you by this Office on May 1, 1959.

May I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry if it is not correct that that legislative message was not forwarded to the Senator from Louisiana, but was forwarded to Representative WHITTEN?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The draft was prepared for Congressman WHITTEN. I only received an information copy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. A copy of it was sent to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Let me state further to the Senator from Missouri that when I saw that the Secretary used the term "updating" I took it to mean his earlier three-crop proposals had been revised, and perhaps extended to cover the field indicated by the President in his letter to me, that is, made to cover all commodities subject to mandatory price supports, except corn, with which the President indicates satisfaction. Unfortunately, this was not done.

The only thing the Secretary has done is that instead of sending us alternative bills he sent us the first alternative.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The letter of the President would seem to imply that the Secretary of Agriculture would send an omnibus bill giving the position of the department to the Congress. But all the Secretary of Agriculture did, apparently after he had seen his copy of the letter to the Senator from the President, was to send a reaffirmation of the same position he stated to Representative WHITTEN on May 1. At that time he sent a personal copy of the Whitten letter to the Senator, but not to the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that in the letter of the President to the Senator of August 1, the closing language reads:

> The Secretary of Agriculture will supply you with drafts of legislative language to effectuate my recommendations.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. But all the Secretary of Agriculture sent the Senator, attached to his letter of August 3, are the recommendations made on a few crops many months ago; is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that, although the Secretary stated in the letter—

> It should be noted that this language is, in effect, an updating of the legislative language forwarded to you by this office on May 1, 1959.

Nothing was forwarded to the Senator except the copy of a letter written by Edward M. Shulman, Acting General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, to the Honorable JAMIE L. WHITTEN, chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. That proposed legislation was drafted at the request of Mr. WHITTEN, as I understand the situation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that the letter from the Acting General Counsel to Mr. WHITTEN says, in the last paragraph:

> Since you have requested the Department to prepare this draft legislation as a drafting service, the enclosed draft legislation has not been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My able friend from Louisiana has been here a great deal longer than have I, but in the executive branch, when we proposed legislation which did not necessarily conform to our opinion or that of the executive branch, we were careful to note it did not go through the Bureau of the Budget. Therefore, would not the proper interpretation of the last paragraph be that it is a submission of proposed legislation in accordance with a request from Representative WHITTEN, but in no case does it necessarily follow the views of the Department as to what legislation was desirable.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly what I think. The Senator is correct in his conclusions.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able chairman of the Senate committee. This is but additional evidence, presented in even more definite form that, whereas the Secretary of Agriculture spends much time criticizing the Congress for what it tries to accomplish in the field of agriculture—the Secretary himself, either because he is unwilling or unable, has consistently refused to fulfill the promise he made last February that he would send the Congress an omnibus, overall farm bill representing his recommendations as to what should be acted on at this session of Congress.

Does the distinguished chairman of the committee agree with those observations?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question but that the Secretary did promise to send us an omnibus bill. In all fairness, however, the Secretary indicated in his testimony that it might not be necessary to send to Congress legislation covering cotton, rice, and corn, because the Secretary preferred to give the new programs covering those commodities an opportunity to operate before submitting further proposed legislation affecting them.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I understand that; but after the Secretary made those observations, as a result of further interrogation on the part of the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin, the Secretary nevertheless did promise to send to Congress an omnibus farm bill for the consideration of the Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. The original record so shows.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, and that word "original" is very important. As of this time, does the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry know what is the omnibus overall farm legislation which the Department of Agriculture or the President would like to see passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know. I wish I did. I have done my best to find out but I am still in the dark. We have asked for such legislation, we were apparently promised it, if I read the President's letter correctly, yet it has not been forthcoming.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I again commend my able and distinguished colleague for the fine work he has been doing for American farmers, despite the many blocks thrown in the way of his efforts to provide sound legislation, and thrown by those very people who under our form of government are supposed to be working for the farmer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, earlier I referred to the fact that prior legislative drafts made available to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had been phrased in the alternative. The proposed legislation which I have just received is not phrased in the alternative, but is identical with the first alternative offered by the administration 5 months ago. Specifically, as to wheat, the Secretary proposes exactly the same program he submitted in February; that is, authority to base price supports on 75 to 90 percent of the preceding 3-year average price; authority to increase acreage allotments by up to 50 percent, removal of the present 30-acre limit on wheat produced for on-farm consumption, and so forth, and discontinuance of acreage allotments and marketing quotas on wheat after 1963, with price supports at 90 percent of the 3-year average.

As to peanuts, price support would be based on 90 percent of the 3-year average price, and the Secretary would be given authority to increase the national acreage allotment by up to 50 percent.

These authorities would be coupled with the possibility of marketing orders.

For tobacco, price support in 1960 and 1961 based on 75 to 90 percent of the 3-year average price, with price support in 1962 and subsequent years, based upon 90 percent of the 3-year average price.

Mr. President, as I indicated earlier, the Secretary of Agriculture has not even taken the trouble to redraft the legislation he offered to the Congress in the light of its rejection earlier this year.

In my opinion, he has not done what I had hoped the President would direct him to do, and that is to submit legisislation which—and I quote from the President's letter to me—"will prove to be acceptable to the Congress."

The Secretary well knows that the proposed legislation he sent to us earlier this year was not acceptable to the Congress, and he should know that merely submitting this same proposed legislation under a cover letter bearing a different date is not going to change the congressional attitude toward it.

I had hoped that the exchange of letters between President Eisenhower and me offered the possibility of bringing before the Congress remedial farm legislation in time for enactment this year.

Unfortunately, I cannot say at this time that such is the case.

Once again the President has asked for corrective legislation covering all crops except corn. Once again the Secretary has sent us draft legislation covering only wheat, tobacco and peanuts.

For the first time, in his letter to me, the President indicated that the Department of Agriculture was going to be instructed to take the attitude of Congress into consideration.

The Department has not done so, but has forwarded to Congress legislation no different from that which we have already carefully considered and which was rejected. Yet, in his letter to me Mr. Benson has the temerity to state that—and I quote:

> It should be noted that this language is, in effect, an up dating of the legislative language forwarded to you by this office on May 1, 1959.

The Secretary has his dates wrong. The legislation he sent me was first made available to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in February—not in May. The language sent to me under date of May 1 was a copy of language which the Department had prepared as a drafting service for Representative WHITTEN of Mississippi, as was brought out by my good friend from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. According to my files, Under Secretary Morse forwarded this legislation to me along with a copy of a letter from Acting General Counsel Edward Shulman addressed to Representative WHITTEN, in which Mr. Shulman states:

> Since you have requested the Department to prepare this draft legislation as a drafting service, the enclosed draft legislation has not been submitted to the Bureau of Budget.

Mr. President, it is obvious that the Secretary of Agriculture is once again laying the cornerstone for what I feel sure will be a series of nationwide speaking trips endeavoring to lay the blame for no new farm legislation at the doorstep of Congress.

I think the facts demonstrate that the Congress is willing to act, as I stated earlier, if the executive branch is prepared to discuss farm legislation with the Congress in a spirit of conciliation and compromise—the same spirit in which I, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, approached President Eisenhower late last month. Events have demonstrated that no one is going to have exactly his own way on farm legislation. This covers Mr. Benson, the various farm organizations, Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and others.

If we are to achieve agreement on constructive farm legislation, it will be necessary for all involved to give a little and take a little.

Obviously, despite the President's indication in his letter to me that the executive branch was prepared to take the attitude of Congress into consideration in drafting new farm legislation, that spirit of conciliation and compromise has not yet infected the Secretary of Agriculture.

I am distressed that such is the case, but the facts are there for all to see.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter addressed by me to the President, dated July 23, 1959, together with a letter from the President to me, dated August 1, 1959, in reply to the letter to which I have just referred.

There being on objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 23, 1959.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I note from the transcript of your press conference held on Wednesday, July 22, that you list among the essential bills which Congress should enact before adjournment a "decent farm bill which I think is terribly important to the United States even at this late date."

I would be most grateful, Mr. President, if you would kindly have a bill prepared embracing your views on farm legislation.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I can assure you that if you will supply us with draft legislation conforming to your own views and which you believe could be enacted by the Congress, such legislation will receive expeditious and thorough consideration by my committee.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
U.S. Senator.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 1, 1959.

The Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: I appreciate your assurance of July 23 that you would welcome a bill embracing my views on farm legislation.

First, I suggest a careful reexamination of my January 29 message on agriculture in which my views are set forth on price support levels. For ease of reference, I quote below the most relevant part:

"I recommend that prices for those commodities subject to mandatory supports be related to a percentage of the average market price during the immediately preceding years. The appropriate percentage of the average market price should be discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture at a level not less than 75 and not more than 90 percent of such average in accordance with the general guidelines set forth in the law. Growers of corn, our most valuable crop, have already chosen, by referendum vote, program changes which include supports based on such an average of market prices."

I understand that between the time of my message and May 1 your office was supplied with various drafts of legislation in keeping with the administration's views. My recommendations, in capsule form, are these:

For wheat: Liberalization of planting restrictions and the basing of price supports on recent market behavior.

For tobacco: Correction of price support levels and retention of marketing quotas.

For peanuts: Authority to adjust acreage allotments upward, to relate price supports to recent market history, and to utilize marketing orders.

Conservation reserve: Extension of the program in time and funds.

Public Law 480: Continuation for 1 year of authority to sell surplus farm products for foreign currency and an increase of $1,500 million in the amount authorized to be expended.

Your committee has already reported out a bill extending Public Law 480. I trust that farm legislation, particularly with respect to wheat, can be favorably acted upon this year by your committee in a form that will prove to be acceptable to the Congress and in such form that I can approve consistently with the interests of all Americans.

The Secretary of Agriculture will supply you with drafts of legislative language to effectuate my recommendations.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from Secretary of Agriculture Benson dated August 3, 1959, with attachments thereto, containing the legislation which he suggested, according to his letter, pursuant to the President's promise.

There being no objection, the letter and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 3, 1959.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: In the President's letter to you of August 1, he stated that the Secretary of Agriculture would furnish you with appropriate language to implement the President's legislative recommendations with respect to agriculture. We are attaching a copy of the proposed legal language along with appropriate explanations of the proposed legislation.

It should be noted that this language is, in effect, an updating of the legislative language forwarded to you by this office on May 1, 1959.

Prior to May 1, alternative drafts of legislation to implement the administration's proposals were forwarded to Mr. Harker Stanton, counsel. These drafts were forwarded individually beginning March 12, 1959, with wheat and ending on April 30, 1959, with the conservation reserve extension.

I would be most pleased if the recommendations which we are now forwarding would receive favorable action both by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Congress. They are sound. They merit your support.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Agricultural Act of 1959".

TITLE I—WHEAT

Discontinuance of acreage allotments and marketing quotas on wheat

SEC. 101. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended:

(1) By amending subsection (f) of section 335 by deleting item (1) and renumbering items (2), (3), and (4) as items (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

(2) By adding at the end of section 333 the following:

"The national acreage allotment determined under the foregoing provisions of this section may be increased by not more than 50 per centum for any crop of wheat beginning with the 1961 crop if the Secretary determines that such increase is necessary in the interests of the welfare of the agricultural economy (1) to avoid hardships to wheat producers, (2) to meet potential market demands for wheat, (3) to avoid undue restrictions on production or marketings of wheat, (4) to prevent disruption in the orderly marketing of wheat, (5) to insure

adequate farm income, or (6) because of any combination of the factors above."

(3) By adding the following new section:

"SEC. 339. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, acreage allotments and marketing quotas shall not be established for the 1964 and subsequent crops of wheat."

Price support

SEC. 102. Title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 106. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, price support to cooperators for the 1961 crop, the 1962 crop, and the 1963 crop of wheat repectively, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas, shall be at such level not less than 75 per centum or more than 90 per centum of the average price received by farmers during the three marketing years immediately preceding the marketing year for such crop as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act. Price support for each such crop of wheat in the case of noncooperators and in the case marketing quotas are disapproved shall be as provided in section 101(d) (3) and (5). The level of price support for the 1964 crop and each subsequent crop of wheat shall be 90 per centum of the average price received by farmers during the three marketing years immediately preceding the marketing year for such crop. The Secretary shall determine and announce the support price for each crop of wheat in advance of the planting season on the basis of the statistics and other information available at that time, and such support price shall be final."

TITLE II—PEANUTS

Price support

SEC. 201. Title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 107. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, the level of price support to cooperators for the 1960 and each subsequent crop of peanuts, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas, shall be 90 per centum of the average price received by farmers during the three marketing years immediately preceding the marketing year for such crop. Price support for each such crop of peanuts in the case of noncooperators and in case marketing quotas are disapproved shall be as provided in section 101(d) (3) and (5). The Secretary shall determine and announce the support price for each crop of peanuts in advance of the planting season on the basis of the statistics and other information available at that time, and such support price shall be final."

Authority to increase the national acreage allotment

SEC. 202. Section 358(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The national acreage allotment determined under the foregoing provisions of this section may be increased by not more than 50 per centum for any crop of peanuts beginning with the 1960 crop if the Secretary determines that such increase is necessary in the interests of the welfare of the agricultural economy (1) to avoid hardships to peanut producers, (2) to meet potential market demands for peanuts, (3) to avoid undue restrictions on production or marketings of peanuts, (4) to prevent disruption in the orderly marketing of peanuts, (5) to insure adequate farm income, or (6) because of any combination of the factors above."

Marketing orders

SEC. 203. Section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 608c) is further amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (2) is amended by inserting "peanuts," before "soybeans,".

(2) Subparagraph (B) of paragraph (11) is amended by inserting "or peanuts and their products," after "milk and its products,".

Substitution of marketing orders for farm allotments and quotas

SEC. 204. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding following section 359 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 360. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, if and when the major peanut production or major peanut marketing areas as determined by the Secretary become covered by an order or orders to effect under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, (1) any national marketing quota previously proclaimed for any crop of peanuts to be regulated under such order or orders and any farm acreage allotments or marketing quotas established pursuant to such national marketing quota shall cease to be effective, and (2) the Secretary shall not thereafter proclaim a national marketing quota for any crop of peanuts."

Price support if marketing orders are in effect

SEC. 205. Effective beginning with the first crop of peanuts for which farm acreage allotments and marketing quotas are not in effect as a result of the operation of section 360 of the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended as follows: (1) By inserting after the words "any basic agricultural commodity" in the first sentence of section 101 the words "except peanuts"; (2) by striking from section 101(b) the words "and peanuts"; and (3) by amending section 107 to read as follows:

"SEC. 107. The Secretary is authorized to make available through loans, purchases or other operations price support to producers for peanuts at such level not in excess of 90 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act."

TITLE III—TOBACCO

SEC. 301. Title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 108. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act,

(a) price support to cooperators for the 1960 crop and the 1961 crop of tobacco, respectively, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas, shall be at such level not less than 75 per centum or more than 90 per centum of the average price received by farmers during the three marketing years immediately preceding the marketing year for such crop as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act,

(b) the level of price support to cooperators for the 1962 crop and each subsequent crop of tobacco, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas, shall be 90 per centum of the average price received by farmers during the three marketing years immediately preceding the marketing year for such crop,

(c) no price support shall be made available for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers, and

(d) price support may be made available to noncooperators for any crop of tobacco at such level not in excess of the level of price support to cooperators, as the Secretary determines will facilitate the effective operation of the program.

The Secretary shall determine and announce the support price for each crop of tobacco in advance of the planting season on the basis of the statistics and other information available at that time, and such support price shall be final.

SEC. 302. Subsection (e) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and section 2 of the Act of July 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 506), as amended, are repealed effective with the 1960 crop.

TITLE IV—CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

SEC. 401. Section 108(b) of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Effective beginning with 1961, the Secretary shall give special consideration to those States and regions where it is necessary to discourage the production of wheat."

SEC. 402. Section 109 of the Soil Bank Act is amended:

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary is authorized to formulate and announce programs under this subtitle B and to enter into contracts thereunder with producers during the eight-year period 1956–63 to be carried out during the period ending not later than December 31, 1972, except that contracts for the establishment of tree cover may continue until December 31, 1977."

(2) by striking out in subsection (c) "$450,000,000", and substituting in lieu thereof "$500,000,000".

SEC. 403. Section 211 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended by striking out "three years" wherever it appears therein and substituting "six years".

TITLE V—EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 480

SEC. 501. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 109 and 204 of such Act are amended by striking out "1959" and substituting in lieu thereof "1960".

(2) Section 103(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "1959" and substituting in lieu thereof "1960" and by striking out "$2,250,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,750,000,000".

(3) Section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out "$800,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,100,000,000".

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

WHEAT

The proposed legislation would provide for relaxing controls for the 1961, 1962, and 1963 crops of wheat by authorizing the Secretary to increase the national acreage allotment for wheat up to 50 percent above the level determined by the existing formula, and by removing the present 30-acre limit on the number of acres of wheat which may be grown on a farm for use on the farm as feed, food or seed without penalty. Acreage allotments and marketing quotas on wheat would be discontinued after 1963.

The level of price support for the 1961, 1962, and 1963 crops of wheat would be at such level not less than 75 or more than 90 percent of the average price received by farmers during the 3 preceding marketing years as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of the general guidelines specified in section 401(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. The level of price support after 1963 would be 90 percent of the average price received for the 3 preceding marketing years.

PEANUTS

The proposed legislation contains provisions which would make changes in existing law as follows:

1. Peanuts would be supported at 90 percent of the average price received by farmers during the 3 preceding marketing years. This provision would be in effect as long as

the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, remain effective and peanut producers do not disapprove marketing quotas.

2. The Secretary would be given authority to increase the national acreage allotment for peanuts by not more than 50 percent.

3. The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, would be amended to authorize the issuance of marketing orders for peanuts.

4. If and when the major peanut production or marketing areas become covered by a marketing order or orders, any national marketing quota previously proclaimed for any crop of peanuts to be regulated under such order or orders and any farm acreage allotment or marketing quotas, established pursuant to such national quota, would cease to be effective and the Secretary would be prohibited thereafter from proclaiming a national marketing quota for any crop of peanuts.

5. Effective beginning with the first crop of peanuts for which farm acreage allotments and marketing quotas are not in effect as a result of the issuance of a marketing order or orders covering the major peanut producing or marketing areas, price support for peanuts would be discretionary at such level not in excess of 90 percent of the parity as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of the general guidelines specified in section 401(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949a as amended.

TOBACCO

The proposed legislation would make the following changes in price support for tobacco:

1. The level of price support for the 1960 and 1961 crops of each kind of tobacco, if marketing quotas are not disapproved, would be at such level not less than 75 or more than 90 percent of the average price received by farmers during the 3 preceding marketing years as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of the general guidelines specified in section 401(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

2. The level of support for the 1962 and subsequent crops of each kind of tobacco, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas, would be 90 percent of the average price received by farmers during the 3 preceding marketing years.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

The proposed legislation would extend the authority to carry out the conservation reserve program for 3 years, by extending the period during which contracts may be signed until 1963, by extending the period during which contracts (except contracts for the establishment of tree cover) may be carried out until 1972, and by extending the period during which contracts for the establishment of tree cover may be carried out to 1977.

The proposed legislation would also increase the amount of funds which may be spent on the program. At the present time under the Soil Bank Act, contracts may not be entered into which would require payments to producers, including the cost of materials and services, in excess of $450 million in any calendar year. The Appropriation Act for the Department further limits the amount which currently may be obligated to $375 million per year. The proposed language would increase the authorization under the Soil Bank Act to $500 million per year.

The Department's recommendation that the authorization for the conservation reserve program be increased to $500 million is subject to the following conditions:

1. Participation under the extended program to emphasize "whole" farms now producing principally price-supported commodities, particularly allotment crops and those for which price support is mandatory.

2. Enactment of price support legislation as proposed in this bill.

The proposed legislation would also amend the Soil Bank Act to provide specific authority for giving special consideration to those States and regions where it is necessary to discourage the production of wheat in distributing the national conservation reserve goal and allocating the funds to the State.

The proposed legislation would also extend section 211 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 for an additional 3 years. Section 211, which expired on May 28, 1959, limits Federal benefits with respect to surplus crops grown on newly irrigated and drained land within any Federal irrigation and drainage project authorized after May 28, 1956, unless such crops had been produced on such land prior to such date and also limits Federal benefits with respect to surplus crops grown on land reclaimed by flood control projects authorized after May 28, 1956, and on land so reclaimed.

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 480

The proposed legislation would: (1) extend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 for 1 year; (2) increase the amount authorized to be expended under title I of such act by $1,500 million; (3) extend title II of the act for 1 year; (4) increase the amount authorized to be expended under title II of such act from $800 million to $1,100 million.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Would the Senator also include in the RECORD a letter of transmittal to him, from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Morse, attaching thereto a letter from Mr. Shulman to Representative WHITTEN?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have that letter and the enclosure, and I will be happy to make it a part of my address.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which the Senator from Missouri has referred be also printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with the enclosure.

There being no objection, the letter and attachment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1959.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: We are enclosing a copy of a letter to Congressman WHITTEN, together with a draft of proposed legislation prepared pursuant to a request made by Congressman WHITTEN at the hearings on the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration appropriations for 1960.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1959.

Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Chairman, Agriculture Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITTEN: In accordance with your request to the Secretary of Agriculture at the hearings before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, this office has prepared the enclosed draft of legislation which you requested. The draft legislation deals with wheat, peanuts, tobacco, the conservation reserve program, and Public Law 480.

Enclosed also are drafts of legislation which have previously been submitted to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee of the Senate at the request of such committee. Some of such drafts have also been furnished the House Agriculture Committee.

Since you have requested the Department to prepare this draft legislation as a drafting service, the enclosed draft legislation has not been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD M. SHULMAN,
Acting General Counsel.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Louisiana says:

If we are to achieve agreement on constructive farm legislation, it will be necessary for all involved to give a little and take a little.

I do not know what farm bill Secretary Benson would like us to pass. Does the chairman feel that he knows what it is the Secretary of Agriculture would like us to pass? If so, what is it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot answer the Senator's question specifically, because the Secretary has never submitted such specific legislation to us. However, as I understand the Secretary's philosophy, his idea is to beat down prices as low as possible, and in that way discourage production.

He has stated, in general, that he favors reducing price supports; yet, in the next breath he proposes to increase acreage, as was the case with his suggestions covering wheat. That does not add up. We already have so much wheat that it is practically running out of our ears. Yet the idea of the Secretary of Agriculture is further to reduce price supports and increase acreage. This would certainly result in increased wheat production. Thus, the Secretary's ideas do not add up.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the chairman believe that what Mr. Benson would like to do is to eliminate all price supports?

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be the logical result of his suggestions. Actually, I would gather that the Secretary would like to be a sort of farm czar, with authority to fix price supports at whatever level he might desire—and, evidently, the lower the better. As the Senator knows, past history proves that such a program would not discourage production. The facts show that as prices have been lowered, the more the farmers have planted, in order to obtain greater volume, and an adequate income.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If that is what is in the mind of the Secretary of Agriculture, why was it that only recently he recommended and obtained approval of a plan for corn for this year which raises price supports from 6 to 10 cents on 92 percent of the corn produced in the United States; and at the same time he removed all controls of any kind whatever over the production of corn, notwithstanding the fact we already have $3.4 billion of corn and feed grains already in Government storage?

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe the corn program is probably in line with the President's views on agriculture.

As I have said on many occasions, corn seems to be the fair-haired little blue-eyed baby girl of the price support program. Corn has always fared better than any other basic commodity.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Why?

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish I knew, but somehow, the corn growers always got price supports, whether they complied with acreage allotments or not. The Senator well knows that in the case of cotton, peanuts, and tobacco, the farmers must comply with acreage allotments in order to obtain the benefits of price support, and to avoid penalties for overplanting. Such marketing penalties were never applied to corn. Even when the corn farmers were subject to acreage allotments, the Secretary saw to it that even those who did not comply with allotments got price support. Now, this support was lower, of course, than supports for those who complied with acreage allotments. However the fact is that corn was and still is treated in a different manner from any other of our basic commodities. Why that is, I do not know.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator consider it right and proper, especially as we all know the price of corn affects the price of livestock, especially hogs for the Secretary to go around the country boasting about livestock prices being high, and no storage problems because hogs were being sold in a free market, while at the same time he has stored up more than $3.4 billion in feed grains which, if they were released, would naturally result in a collapse of the livestock market?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to my good friend from Missouri that I hope Mr. Benson continues to make speeches. I want to see him explain to the American people what is going to happen to hog prices, what is now happening to poultry prices, as well as what will soon happen to the price of beef. My guess is that, as in the past, he will try to blame Congress for the gluts in these commodities, and the gluts are on the way, thanks to abundant and cheap corn and other feed grains. My guess is that he will not take the responsibility, even though it is his. He is the one who actually suggested the corn and other feed grain programs, as the Senator well knows. He also suggested the soil bank program, which has been a total fiasco, but he is doing his best to blame the Congress for that one, too.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is so correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The soil bank program has been an absolute failure. I do not know of any farm program on the statute books which has caused more harm than the soil bank program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. At a cost of many hundreds of millions in taxes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The acreage reserve has cost almost $2 billion, in an effort to take acreage out of cultivation in order to reduce production. Yet, despite the soil bank program, total farm production has been kept at almost an even keel. The Senator well remembers that the first year's operation of the soil bank program cost the taxpayers $180 million for corn alone; 5,600,000 acres of corn were taken out of production. Still, when the corn crop was harvested at the end of the year, it was discovered that the farmers had produced 220 million bushels more than they had produced the year before on 5 million acres less than they had planted the year before.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Congress got the blame for that. But who advocated the program? Mr. Benson did. He is always suggesting, but he is never around to take the responsibility when his suggestions backfire.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Last fall, when visiting around my State, people asked why Congress did not do what Secretary Benson wanted. So when he came before our committee, I asked him, "What is it you want? Provided it is not injurious to the farmer, and will reduce agricultural inventories, I will be for any overall legislation you recommend.

Finally, we got him to agree, for the first time since I have been a member of the committee, that he would send us the overall omnibus legislation which he thought right. Yet, as of now, I do not know what it is he wants in the way of overall farm legislation.

Now the Senator from Louisiana says that, in his opinion, all this correspondence he has placed in the RECORD, together with his very able analysis of that correspondence, is simply preliminary to more Benson tours, with Secretary Benson getting on a plane and going out to chambers of commerce in the great urban areas to attack the farmers again.

That is the essence of what the Senator from Louisiana has so ably presented.

Why is it that the Secretary of Agriculture feels he can continue to attack Congress, while he also continues to refuse, as he has refused in past years, to tell Congress just what overall legislation it is that he wants.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Secretary of Agriculture has a good press. The press prints everything he says. But very little is said about the realities of the farm program. After a loss has been suffered, little is said concerning how it was suffered.

The Senator may remember that only a few months ago I appeared on a television program with Mr. Benson. Mr. Benson had the temerity to state to the audience that the cost of the farm program—we were discussing the farm price support program—was in excess of $20 billion.

I presented to him his own figures and showed to the same audience that the total price support program, from 1933 through December of last year, cost a little more than $5 billion. Despite what his own Department figures showed, he insisted that the program cost $20 billion. Whose version made the headlines? Well, Mr. Benson's, of course.

Mr. Benson has always been able to sell his story to the press. He always manages to claim credit for the good parts of the program, but he blames Congress for the failures, most of which he himself concocted.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Many people have been quite critical of the farm program, but complimentary about our stockpile of minerals, metals, and machine tools. The value of our stockpile of metals, minerals, and machine tools is many billion dollars more than the value of the stockpile of agricultural products now owned by the Government.

For some reason, when we discuss our stockpile of metals, minerals, machine tools, we do so with great pride, treating them as valuable assets. But when we discuss agricultural surpluses, we discuss them with shame and embarrassment.

Does the Senator from Louisiana know why it is that our stockpiles of metals, minerals, and machine tools are considered as greater assets than agricultural surpluses? If the United States should become engaged in real trouble, nonperishable food would be more necessary for the American people than anything else except medical supplies.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know what the answer may be. I do believe that those who administer the programs to which the Senator has referred are more or less in sympathy with them; whereas, the Secretary of Agriculture, in my humble judgment, has never been in sympathy with the farm program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana. That is what I sincerely believe also. It is particularly unfortunate therefore that, at the same time he continues to express his lack of sympathy for the program, he nevertheless continues to refuse to give us his overall recommendations.

INCREASE IN MAXIMUM OIL AND GAS ACREAGE LIMITATION, STATE OF ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6940) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, in order to increase certain acreage limitations with respect to the State of Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask that H.R. 6940 be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of De-

fense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, pp. 15097–15099, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in presenting the conference report on H.R. 7454, the Defense Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1960, I have a happy duty to perform, for I believe that the measure before the Senate is one of the finest defense bills presented to this body over the years while I have been chairman of the Defense Subcommittee.

The action of the conference will appropriate $39,228,239,000 for our Defense Establishment, plus $430 million in transfers from revolving funds. The amount appropriated is $19,961,000 under the budget estimate, $379,900,000 over the amount provided by the House, and $366,100,000 under the amount provided by the Senate.

By service the amounts to be appropriated under the conference report are as follows:

For the Army, $9,375,805,000;

For the Navy, $11,006,503,000;

For the Air Force, $17,472,706,000;

For the Office of the Secretary of Defense, $1,373,225,000.

I ask unanimous consent that a tabular presentation of congressional action on the Defense Department appropriation bill be included at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, through the action of the Senate and House on this bill I believe that we will have strengthened our national defense substantially in both the immediate and more distant future. Senators have the bill before them. I shall merely attempt to present briefly the highlights of the conference action.

First, for modernization of the Army, the conference report provides $1,407,300,000, or approximately $382 million over the budget. In addition, from previous years' appropriations, the bill calls for reprograming $100 million of Nike-Hercules funds and applying this to Army modernization. Through these actions the Congress will have provided needed funds to strengthen that branch of the service which, should there be war, will be urgently called on, regardless of whether the war or conflict be a so-called local or a general war.

Second, the bill contains $35 million for long leadtime procurement items for a nuclear attack aircraft carrier. By this action it should be clearly understood, and was so stated in the conference, that the nuclear attack carrier shall be built and that the funds shall be applied to this purpose and to no other purpose whatsoever. This addition is required if we are to keep our Navy modern. When this carrier joins the fleet, it will replace an obsolete and much slower carrier, built during World War II. Its deck design will not only permit the landing of more modern aircraft, but will enable all aircraft to land with a much higher degree of safety than would be possible on the older type carrier.

I believe that the Senate subcommittee, the full committee, and the Senate itself acted wisely in insisting that this modern carrier be built, and in the years to come the conferees will find their inclusion of the carrier looked upon as farsighted. I particularly wish to commend my good friend and colleague the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] for the important part he played in making certain that this modern carrier would be funded in this bill so that construction can be initiated immediately.

Third, the conference agreed to an amount of $137 million over the budget for increased emphasis on antisubmarine warfare. Funds so provided will provide for the procurement of more antisubmarine submarines, aircraft, and helicopters, and accelerate the research and development and procurement connected with other submarine countermeasures.

Fourth, the bill retains funds restored by the Senate for 35 jet utility trainers and 14 jet navigation trainers for the Air Force. These aircraft will enable the Air Force to train its crews in the most modern advances in jet aircraft development. In addition, aircraft procurement funds relating to the 1-percent reduction and funds for safety of flight modifications were retained, as provided previously by the Senate. Bomarc funds amounting to $79.9 million were also included. Furthermore, although no funds were specifically recommended, through language in the bill and report and through additional funds not specially earmarked, the Congress has approved authority to utilize existing funds for the procurement of the Mace missile.

Fifth, the bill contains funds for certain increases in military personnel above the amounts requested. For the Marine Corps funds are provided to maintain a strength of 200,000; for the Army Reserve, 300,000, and for the Army National Guard, 400,000. Mandatory language has been included to provide for the National Guard strength of 400,000, and in addition, the conference committee was assured by the administration that the Army Reserve strength will be maintained at 300,000 during fiscal 1960 and that the Army National Guard will be maintained at the 400,000 figure. It is the fervent hope of members of the conference that the highest responsible officials will also reexamine strength requirements in the Marine Corps in the light of past history and the turbulent present-day possibilities, and increase the dwindling strength of our Marine Corps to 200,000, for which funds were provided.

The conferees and the chairman of the conference committee were assured by high authority in the administration that it was the purpose to keep the National Guard at 400,000, the Reserve at 300,000, and the Marine Corps at 200,000.

Sixth, the conference bill has provided a general restoration of approximately half of the 1-percent reductions made by the House in operations and procurement accounts.

With reference to section 631, the Senate language as amended on the floor was unacceptable to the conference committee. Instead the conference accepted the House version of section 631, which uses the terms "air transportation" and "air carrier" in accordance with the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. It was agreed that $85 million would be earmarked from MATS funds for expenditure with such air carriers.

My point is that the conferees agreed that section 631, which uses the terms "air transportation" and "air carrier" will be interpreted and applied in accordance with the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

As has been noted, in various categories the conference has increased the funds made available to the Department of Defense for procurement, personnel, and research and development. In certain instances—notably in the ballistic, strategic and tactical missile fields—broad flexibility has been provided to the Secretary to enable the Department of Defense to accelerate promising breakthroughs. In all instances where increased funds have been provided, the conferees have acted with only one purpose in mind: to provide the Department with the funds it believes necessary to give our country the strongest defense possible.

The action taken by the conferees on this bill was completely nonpartisan, motivated solely by patriotic considerations. It is my earnest hope that it will be looked upon in this light by those who have charge of the utilization of the funds appropriated, and that a reevaluation will be undertaken in the unresolved areas of military strength and hardware procurement. In view of continued international tensions, it is hoped that due consideration be given certain congressional convictions, as evidenced by the changes made in the Defense Department's request.

The measure before the Senate is, in the opinion of the conferees, a strong one, which will provide a firm step forward in the year ahead, not only in modernizing our Army, Navy, and Air Force, but also in encouraging the acceleration of vital missile development for the long pull.

I wish again to thank all those who have helped forge this measure: the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the individual Senators who have contributed so much, the House members of the conference committee with whom we worked so amicably; and the officials of the Department of Defense who were always cooperative.

I urge the prompt adoption of the conference report.

EXHIBIT 1

Department of Defense—Congressional action on fiscal year 1960 budget requests, by appropriation title, H.R. 7454, regular Defense Department appropriation bill, military functions

(Note: Some items not comparable, 1959–60, due to budget structure adjustments.)

TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL

Item	Appropriations, 1959 [1]	Budget estimates, 1960	House action	Senate action	Conference agreement
Military personnel, Army	[2] $3,175,961,000	[2] $3,314,063,000	[2] $3,233,063,000	[2] $3,233,063,000	[2] $3,233,063,000
Military personnel, Navy	[2] 2,420,618,200	[2] 2,476,700,000	[2] 2,476,700,000	[2] 2,476,700,000	[2] 2,476,700,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps	[2] 635,692,000	[2] 596,900,000	[2] 596,900,000	[2] 620,600,000	[2] 620,600,000
Military personnel, Air Force	3,941,801,000	[2] 3,914,000,000	[2] 3,912,000,000	[2] 3,892,000,000	[2] 3,912,000,000
Reserve personnel, Army	222,759,000	202,000,000	231,700,000	231,700,000	231,700,000
Reserve personnel, Navy	90,098,000	88,000,000	88,000,000	88,000,000	88,000,000
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	23,760,000	24,300,000	24,300,000	24,300,000	24,300,000
Reserve personnel, Air Force	53,746,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000
Army National Guard	353,093,000	191,961,000	234,961,000	234,961,000	234,961,000
National Guard personnel, Army		48,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000
Air National Guard	251,880,800	715,000,000	715,000,000	715,000,000	715,000,000
National Guard personnel, Air Force					
Retired pay, Department of Defense	640,000,000				
Total, title I—Military personnel	11,809,409,000	11,624,924,000	11,614,624,000	11,618,324,000	11,638,324,000

TITLE II—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Operation and maintenance, Army	$3,117,238,000	$3,053,785,000	$3,065,390,000	$3,085,390,000	$3,075,390,000
Operation and maintenance, Navy	[3] 2,575,515,900	[4] 2,803,192,000	2,599,320,000	2,621,720,000	2,611,220,000
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	[5] 173,117,000	([4])	[4] 171,350,000	175,850,000	175,850,000
Operation and maintenance, Air Force	4,119,525,000	4,256,800,000	4,167,506,000	4,222,506,000	4,195,006,000
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard		146,000,000	157,000,000	151,700,000	151,700,000
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard		169,000,000	169,000,000	169,000,000	169,000,000
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Communication System, Army	5,667,200	5,676,000	5,676,000	5,676,000	5,676,000
Salaries and expenses, Secretary of Defense	16,545,000	20,500,000	20,500,000	20,500,000	20,500,000
Office of Public Affairs	448,500				
Claims, Department of Defense	16,520,000	16,500,000	16,500,000	16,500,000	16,500,000
Contingencies, Department of Defense	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Olympic winter games, Department of Defense		[6] 800,000	400,000	800,000	800,000
Salaries and expenses, Court of Military Appeals, Department of Defense	405,200	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000
Total, title II—Operation and maintenance	10,055,281,800	10,502,978,000	10,403,367,000	10,485,367,000	10,437,367,000

TITLE III—PROCUREMENT

Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	$1,669,338,000	$1,024,700,000	$1,232,300,000	$1,450,000,000	$1,407,300,000
Aircraft and related procurement, Navy	2,033,795,000	1,950,294,000	1,969,394,000	1,950,294,000	1,961,644,000
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	2,069,400,000	1,498,200,000	1,322,000,000	1,636,200,000	1,330,700,000
Procurement of ordnance and ammunition, Navy	602,535,000	564,069,000	627,369,000	564,069,000	567,719,000
Procurement, Marine Corps	25,000,000	135,200,000	133,850,000	133,850,000	133,850,000
Aircraft procurement, Air Force		4,409,100,000	4,165,700,000	4,316,600,000	4,284,600,000
Missile procurement, Air Force		2,601,200,000	2,448,300,000	2,552,900,000	2,540,550,000
Other procurement, Air Force		1,165,200,000	1,104,100,000	1,115,200,000	1,109,650,000
Aircraft, missiles, and related procurement, Air Force	6,643,475,000				
Procurement other than aircraft and missiles, Air Force	2,220,020,000				
Total, title III—Procurement	15,263,563,000	13,347,963,000	13,003,013,000	13,719,113,000	13,336,013,000

TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Research and development (Army)	$507,345,000				
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army		$1,046,515,000	$1,046,515,000	$1,035,715,000	$1,035,715,000
Research and development (Navy)	830,779,300				
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy		970,920,000	1,015,920,000	970,920,000	1,015,920,000
Research and development (Air Force)	751,829,000				
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force		1,149,900,000	1,159,900,000	1,159,900,000	1,159,900,000
Salaries and expenses, Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense	520,000,000	455,000,000	455,000,000	455,000,000	455,000,000
Emergency fund, Department of Defense	[7] 150,000,000	[7] 150,000,000	[7] 150,000,000	[7] 150,000,000	[8] 150,000,000
Total, title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	2,759,953,300	3,772,335,000	3,827,335,000	3,771,535,000	3,816,535,000
Total appropriations, titles I, II, III, and IV	39,888,207,100	39,248,200,000	38,848,339,000	39,594,339,000	39,228,239,000

[1] Includes amounts appropriated in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959.

[2] In addition, the following amounts to be derived by transfer from revolving funds:

	Fiscal year 1959	Fiscal year 1960 budget	Fiscal year 1960 House action	Fiscal year 1960 Senate action	Fiscal year 1960 conference agreement
Military personnel:					
Army	$375,000,000	$200,000,000	$281,000,000	$281,000,000	$281,000,000
Navy	135,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
Marine Corps	25,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
Air Force		50,000,000	50,000,000	70,000,000	50,000,000
Total	535,000,000	340,000,000	421,000,000	450,000,000	430,000,000

[3] Includes amounts appropriated under 9 formerly separate titles, as follows:

Aircraft and facilities, Navy	$856,180,500
Civil engineering, Navy	129,118,400
Medical care, Navy	97,698,000
Naval petroleum reserves	1,683,000
Navy personnel, general expenses	87,940,500
Ordnance and facilities, Navy	153,948,700
Servicewide operations, Navy	124,404,300
Servicewide supply and finance, Navy	325,134,500
Ships and facilities, Navy	799,408,000

[4] "Marine Corps Troops and Facilities" estimate submitted as an activity included in "Operation and maintenance, Navy" in the amount of $172,000,000. Recommended as a separate appropriation.

[5] Appropriated under title "Marine Corps Troops and Facilities."

[6] Includes $400,000 requested in H. Doc. No. 102.

[7] In addition, $150,000,000 to be derived by transfer from other appropriations available for obligation in the respective fiscal year.

[8] In addition, $300,000,000 to be derived by transfer from other appropriations available for obligation in the respective fiscal year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say that under the leadership of the Senator from New Mexico, the conference report represents a remarkable overall combination of the views of the administration, the views of the House of Representatives, and the views of the Senate. The conferees worked very diligently; and, as a result, the conference report calls for slightly less than the administration's budget recommendations and approximately halfway between the appropriations voted by the House and those voted by the Senate.

The report adds to the strength of the Army, by adding funds for procurement of new equipment. The report provides funds for additional aircraft, additional ships and, essentially, for a start on a new nuclear aircraft carrier.

The report also provides funds for the Army Reserve, Army National Guard, and the Marine Corps in which all of us are very greatly interested. The report places a floor under the strength of the National Guard and provides it with additional funds.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, that as I understand the conference report—and I believe that the Senator from Massachusetts and the other conferees understand it in the same way I do—although it is true that the report does not provide a floor for the Marine Corps and the Army Reserve, at least it provides increased funds for greater strength, and also for the Army National Guard, for which a floor was provided. We were assured—and I am certain that that assurance was given in the best of faith by the administration—that it would maintain the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard at 300,000 and 400,000, respectively.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding, and the Senator from New Mexico has expressed the matter very clearly.

Mr. President, instead of taking more time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement, which I have prepared, which deals in some detail with the conference report. In part the statement is a reiteration of the statement which has been made by the Senator from New Mexico, and in part it is based on my own views regarding the results of the conference.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

In my judgment, the bill which came out of the conference committee is truly a strength-and-preparedness bill.

I sincerely believe it provides sufficient funds to give the Nation up-to-date, well-balanced defense forces to protect us against any possible enemy.

It does this and still remains within the total budget request.

I wish to emphasize my belief that this bill will keep our military forces strong without jeopardizing the economy of the country on which, in the final analysis, our Nation's security rests. This is good news, it seems to me, for every American. It is indicative of our determination to retain overall military superiority to a potential enemy. Without such strength, it is doubtful that we—or the rest of the free world—would long survive.

Each year, Congress makes a further investment in military equipment and troops to protect our survival as a nation. For fiscal year 1960, the conference bill provides substantial funds: a total of $39,228,239,000 in new obligational authority. This is $19,961,000 under the budget, a significant fact for all American taxpayers. It is $366,100,000 less than the bill passed by the Senate in mid-July and $379,900,000 more than the bill passed by the House in early June.

In addition to new funds, the conference bill provides a total of $430 million in cash transfers from revolving funds of the Department of Defense. This is an increase of $90 million in transfers over the budget and $9 million more than the House provided.

These cash transfers are available to help finance our defense programs, along with the new moneys provided.

This bill is confined to the so-called military functions of the Department of Defense. Military construction items of great importance are contained in a separate bill. Congress recently authorized $1.2 billion for construction of military facilities, bases, and so on. The bill appropriating money under this authorization is still pending.

The $39 billion-plus in the military functions bill reported by the conferees should buy us a lot of military muscle.

Mere expenditure of dollars, however, does not necessarily assure greater defense strength. How we spend our dollars is at least as important as how many dollars we spend. We must make sure we get 100 cents worth of defense for every dollar we spend.

It is true the dollar amounts finally agreed upon by the conferees differ in many instances with both the House bill and the Senate bill. But, in the main, the broad philosophies embodied in both bills are retained in the conference report.

Generally speaking, where the conference report differs from the budget, the reason is a recognition that time and events have overtaken a budget that was prepared many months ago. For example, since the budget was submitted last January, the Department of Defense revised its air defense plan involving the Bomarc and Nike-Hercules missiles. The conference bill reflects this changing emphasis, cutting back even a little further in these programs.

On the other hand, the conference bill steps up our offensive ballistic missile programs and our efforts to defend against ballistic missiles fired at us by an enemy.

We provided extra funds for general war preparedness. We also agreed on additional funds for limited war forces, especially for Army modernization of combat equipment.

We provided more funds for other military programs essential in either general or limited war, such as antisubmarine warfare items and Navy ships.

I wish to assure Members of the Senate that the $366,100,000 reduction in the Senate bill is not any major surrender of the Senate's position on its own bill. The $366 million net reduction is made up of a number of pluses and minuses. The largest single reduction relates to the nuclear attack aircraft carrier.

Instead of the $380 million provided by the Senate for the full amount of the ship, the confereees agreed to provide $35 million for long leadtime items, principally for the atomic reactors. In this way, the Senate figure was reduced by $345 million so far as fiscal year 1960 funds are concerned.

But, the important thing is, the conference action constituted approval of a nuclear attack carrier to replace one of the old World War II vintage carriers now in the fleet. The nuclear carrier should be ready within a few months of the time the conventional carrier requested in the budget would have been ready. In the meantime, the Navy can firm up the design for this second atomic carrier, taking advantage of lessons learned in constructing the *Enterprise*.

I wish to review in a general way the highlights of the conference bill.

In terms of dollars, this is how the conference bill compares with the President's budget request, with the Senate bill, and with the House bill:

New obligational authority:	
President's budget	$39,248,200,000
Senate bill	39,594,339,000
House bill	38,848,339,000
Conference bill	39,228,239,000
Under budget	−19,961,000
Under Senate bill	−366,100,000
Over House	+379,900,000
Transfers from revolving funds:	
President's budget	340,000,000
Senate bill	450,000,000
House bill	421,000,000
Conference bill	430,000,000
Over budget	+90,000,000
Under Senate bill	−20,000,000
Over House bill	+9,000,000

In terms of programs, this is how the Senate and House conferees resolved the differences in the two bills:

MARINES, ARMY RESERVES, AND ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The House conferees accepted the Senate action providing a total of $43.1 million more than the budget to fund a 200,000-man Marine Corps. Both Houses had agreed upon additional funds for 300,000 Army Reserves and 400,000 Army National Guard, representing increases of 30,000 and 40,000 over the budget, respectively.

In all three cases, however, the Senate had provided language establishing these strength levels as mandatory floors and, further, had earmarked the additional funds to be used only for the purpose of the larger force levels.

The conferees retained the mandatory floor under the Army National Guard, but in the case of the Marines and Army Reserves such language was deleted.

New language was substituted for the earmarking provisions, and the understanding was that, if these funds were not used for the purpose of the larger Marines, Reserves, and Guard, the funds would revert to the Treasury.

MISSILES

In recognition of the swift pace of scientific and engineering developments in ballistic missiles, the Senate bill provided language giving the Secretary of Defense more flexibility to apply funds to the most promising programs. House and Senate conferees agreed such flexibility was desirable. The question at issue was how best to draft language to accomplish our purpose.

Substitute language adopted by the conferees permits the Secretary of Defense, under the authority and terms of the emergency fund, to transfer an additional $150 million for accelerating any strategic and tactical missile program.

We hope the Secretary will use this authority to advance missile programs that appear workable and achievable and, by the same token, to halt those which offer little promise of adding appreciably to our defense strength.

MACE MISSILE

Neither the House nor the Senate approved $127.5 million of the budget request for the Mace tactical missile of the Air Force. But the Senate provided transfer authority for the Secretary to take care of commitments to NATO allies for Mace.

In place of the Senate language, it is stated in the conference report that Air Force missile procurement funds shall be available for Mace, provided that the Secretary of Defense first certifies to the Appropriations Committees of Congress that the missile is "essential to the military posture of this country."

BOMARC AND NIKE-HERCULES MISSILES

Regarding the Bomarc air defense missile, the House conferees accepted the Senate restoration of $79.9 million of the $162.7 million cut by the House. Under the revised air defense plan, the Department of Defense asked the Senate to allow $129.9 million for the missile, but we felt that $79.9 million would be adequate.

In the case of the other air defense missile—Nike-Hercules—the House accepted the $10.8 million reduction in Army research for this program made by the Senate bill and proposed by the Department of Defense.

In addition, the conference report directed that $100 million be reprogramed from Nike-Hercules to Army modernization. The Senate had included language in the bill itself to reprogram $117.8 million, $41 million more than the $76.8 million contemplated reprograming under the Department's air defense plan.

These combined actions on Bomarc and Nike-Hercules air defense missiles reflect the conferees' desire to put less emphasis on defensive programs and more emphasis on offensive programs.

AIR FORCE AIRCRAFT

The House conferees agreed with the Senate restoration of $24.5 million for 35 jet utility trainers, $23.4 million for 14 jet navigation trainers, and $50 million for safety of flight modifications. But they would not accept $11 million added by the Senate for 11 F–27 mission support aircraft.

ARMY MODERNIZATION

For Army procurement of equipment and missiles, the conferees agreed upon $175 million of the $217.7 million Senate increase over the House bill. This makes a total of $1,407,300,000 in new funds available in fiscal year 1960, an increase of $382.6 million over the budget.

In addition, the conferees directed the Secretary of Defense to reprogram from Nike-Hercules funds $100 million to be used for purchase of modern Army combat equipment.

Of the $382.6 million increase in new funds over the budget, $20 million relates to the Army National Guard and Reserve and $137 million to speed up the Nike-Zeus antiballistic missile program. This leaves a net of $225.6 million in new money for Army modernization over the budget figure.

With the $100 million ordered reprogramed—and these are mainly prior year funds—there is a total availability of $325.6 million for Army modernization in excess of the budget.

ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE

In the President's budget, about $1.2 billion all told was requested for antisubmarine warfare.

To step up the Navy's antisubmarine warfare programs even further, the conferees added $137.3 million. This compares with the $255.3 million in extra ASW funds in the House bill.

The Senate bill, on the other hand, fully funded the nuclear aircraft carrier in line with the Navy testimony that a carrier was its No. 1 priority—more necessary even than the ASW increases of the House. Also provided in the Senate bill was $18 million for long leadtime items for another nuclear antisubmarine submarine.

Included in the $137.3 million agreed upon by the conferees are full funds for an additional nuclear antisubmarine submarine, helicopters, and other ASW weapons and related equipment.

Thus, the conference bill provides for both the Navy's No. 1 priority and for some very essential antisubmarine warfare items.

PROCUREMENT

The House had made a 1 percent general reduction in all procurement accounts of the military services to encourage better procurement methods. The Senate restored these cuts in full, except in the case of the Marine Corps where the Defense Department accepted the cut. The conferees agreed to one-half of 1 percent general cut, thus splitting the difference between the two bills.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Both the House and Senate bills had provided funds in the operation and maintenance accounts to support the increased number of Marines, Army Reserves, and Army National Guard over the budget. The Senate bill, however, reduced Army Guard operation and maintenance funds for Nike-Hercules support, and the conferees went along with the $5.3 million cut.

The conferees also accepted one-half of the Senate restorations to Army, Navy, and Air Force operation and maintenance accounts for base operating costs, proficiency flying, and operation and maintenance of the active fleet.

The operation and maintenance funds are used to keep our men and equipment in combat readiness.

MATS

The conference bill specifies that $85 million of MATS funds shall be available only for procurement of commercial air transportation service. This is $5 million more than the House bill and $15 million less than the Senate bill.

Last year $80 million was so earmarked. Except for the dollar change, the provision this year is identical to the 1959 act and to the House bill. Again, it directs the Secretary of Defense to utilize the services of civil air carriers which qualify as small businesses to the fullest extent found practicable.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is my firm belief that this bill will add considerable strength to our defense posture.

What I said in regard to the Senate bill applies equally to the conference bill.

It emphasizes offense and avoids overemphasis on defense in order to give us the greatest deterrent forces for our dollars invested.

It recognizes the onrush of science, technology, and military weaponry and gives the administration the flexibility to make the most of these advances.

It recognizes the need for preparedness for limited war as well as for all-out nuclear war.

I urge the Senate to approve the conference report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I must say that I am disappointed at the action of the conferees insofar as a mandatory floor for the Marine Corps is concerned. I say that without any thought of questioning the strong support and the attitude of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who throughout his career in public office has been a stanch and stout defender of the Marine Corps.

But I am disturbed that on the basis of two actions taken during this fiscal year—one, in the supplemental appropriation bill which provided strong amendatory language increasing the size of the Marine Corps to 200,000 men; and the other, in the course of the hearings on the regular Department of Defense appropriation bill, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, again including amendatory language, and making it mandatory that the strength of the Marine Corps be maintained at not less than 200,000—such results have not been achieved.

I have an idea of the difficulties which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico had to surmount in order to bring to us a conference report which provides for as much as he was able to get the conferees to agree to.

But I should like to point out that in April, 9,989 officers and men were discharged from the Marine Corps, with the result that in that month the strength of the Marine Corps amounted to only 174,709. In other words, the Marines found it impossible to maintain even the 175,000 strength requested by this administration. That was because of the fact that the Marines were forced to discharge many men early, and therefore the Marine Corps suffered a consequent loss in strength.

I am hopeful that the attitude of the chairman and of the other members of the Senate committee and of the Senate conferees, and the statements they have made—to the effect that this money is to be allowed with the intent that it will be used to maintain a strong Marine Corps—will result in the use of the money in the way and for the purpose they intend, and for no other purpose, so that the first line of our defense will be kept active, and so that this mobile and ready striking force will achieve what Congress intended it to achieve when it passed the bill which provided for three combat-size divisions and three air wings for the Marine Corps.

Again I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico, who fought long and hard for what the Senate believed to be best for the country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me point out to the Senator from Montana that the Senate conferees were, in addition to myself, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. Not one of them failed to try his very best to carry out what the Senator from Montana has in mind. But we simply were unable to do so. The House conferees were adamant. And, after all, it is necessary to have the Congress take final action on the bill, and send it to the President for his signature. It was only after encountering that extremely adamant opposition on the part of the House conferees that we agreed to submit this report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that, and I know that the Senator from New

Mexico did the very best he possibly could.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico and all the other conferees on the part of the Senate for their report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill. I believe they have done an outstanding job in reconciling the House and Senate versions of the bill.

As is always the case when it is necessary to compromise differences, in order to get on with the job to be done, each of the Members of this body might have preferred a different result for one or more of the individual items covered by the bill. I believe all of us will agree, however, that the changes made by the Congress have considerably improved and strengthened the bill.

Several weeks ago, when the Defense Department appropriation bill was debated on the floor, I discussed the inadequacies of the 1960 budget and the significant reservations expressed by each of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Rather than repeat that now, I refer to pages 13177 through 13179 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 13.

Although the bill as reported by the conference committee calls for appropriating $19,961,000 less than the President's budget, the report provides additional resources for meeting—at least in part—a number of the reservations expressed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I wish to mention a few of the notable improvements made by the Congress in the Defense Department appropriation bill:

First. Funds for procurement of equipment and missiles by the Army have been increased by $382,600,000. In addition, at least $100 million of funds available for the Nike-Hercules are to be reprogramed for Army modernization. These two steps alone provide close to one-half a billion dollars to accelerate the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile program and to improve Army modernization and firepower.

Second. The Army National Guard is to be maintained at 400,000, rather than cut to the 360,000 proposed in the budget.

Third. The Army Reserve is to be maintained at 300,000, rather than cut to 270,000.

Fourth. Funds have been provided to start construction of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. The Budget Bureau had proposed that this carrier be powered with conventional engines.

Fifth. An additional $137,300,000 has been provided to accelerate antisubmarine warfare programs, including $45 million additional in the vital area of research and development.

Sixth. The Marine Corps will be built up to a fighting strength of 200,000 by the end of fiscal year 1960. The budget proposed maintaining a reduced strength of 175,000.

Seventh. An additional $172 million for procurement and research and development funds have been provided to accelerate ballistic missile programs. In addition, the Secretary of Defense has been provided with new authority to transfer $150 million to accelerate any strategic or tactical missile programs, whenever such action would be advantageous to the national defense.

Mr. President, I believe that the Congress can be proud of the many improvements it has made in the defense appropriations bill. It is an example of what can be done by men of good will working in the national interest.

Of course, this is not the whole story. With this bill, the Congress is providing the executive branch with the means to make needed improvements in our defense programs. Our efforts will go for naught, however, if the administration chooses to ignore the clearly expressed will of the Congress.

I sincerely hope that this will not be the case. This bill is the product of long hours of work and deliberation by conscientious Members of both Houses and of both parties. I believe that the Congress has clearly met its responsibilities in providing the resources and authority needed to provide for the national defense. We have every right to expect the executive branch to do the same.

Again I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for handling this troublesome bill, the largest appropriation bill we shall consider this year, in an able and expeditious manner.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to join other Members of the Senate in commending the Senator from New Mexico. He did a very good job. It was rather difficult, to say the least, for us to sit day in and day out, and fight for the Senate amendments, and in particular the amendments providing floors for the Reserves, Marines, and the National Guard. One important provision we were able to retain, concerned the limitation on the use of the funds which were provided to increase the strength of the National Guard, Reserves, and the Marine Corps.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it is not used for the purpose specified, the money will return to the Treasury.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If I may interrupt the Senator at that point, heretofore we have so provided, but instead of using the money to get a floor of 200,000 men, the money was used for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Now it is provided that if the money is not used for the purpose specified, it shall go back to the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the chances are the money will be used for the purposes provided.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am satisfied that in the case of the National Guard, as well as the Reserves, the money provided will no doubt be used to raise strength to the levels desired by the Congress.

Mr. President, I had my staff prepare an analysis of the defense budget for fiscal year 1960. A good many persons are under the impression that most of the money contained in this bill goes for new hardware, for airplanes, and so forth.

Of a total military budget of $40,453,764,000, and this sum includes $1,225,525,000, authorized for military construction, I wish to point out that over one-fourth, or 28.8 percent to be specific, involving a total of $11,638,324,000, goes for military personnel and retirement pay.

For operations and maintenance—that is, for gasoline and other supplies necessary to operate the hardware we have on hand—another 25.8 percent of the budget aggregating $10,437,367,000 is spent. Only 28.5 percent or $11,490,813,000, goes for procurement—that is, for the purchase of tanks, ships, and other necessary materiel.

Only 14 percent of the defense budget, or $5,661,735,000, is earmarked for research and development, which is a program that has expanded greatly during the past few years.

This money is not spent for equipment, but solely for research and the acquisition of prototypes.

Of the total defense budget, in the neighborhood of 3 percent or $1,225,525,000 could be used for construction, if the current authorization bill is fully funded.

On many occasions I have expressed my concern over the rapidity with which money that is expended for retirement pay is increasing.

In 1950 the entire cost of retirement was $189,444,000. For fiscal year 1960 it will be $715 million. By 1963 it is estimated that retirement pay and related benefits will require the expenditure of $1,109 million. By 1970 the cost of retirement pay alone will be almost $2 billion.

It is my hope that study will be given to this problem.

Congress has already acted on legislation to retire some 4,000 Navy and Marine officers at an earlier date than the law now requires. It strikes me that if there are that many excess officers, we ought to look into the feasibility of perhaps admitting fewer cadets into the military academies. It seems to me that it makes little sense to keep increasing enrollments at the academies and, in the same breath, retiring officers still able to perform a service for their country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana those two bills went through the Senate last week. One of them concerned the Navy alone, and the other bill concerned all the services. If I may use a colloquial term, one of the bills involves a question of getting rid of the "hump" which was created in the Navy during World War II. The Army and Air Force have already gotten rid of their "humps" under previous legislation.

The bill was discussed by the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Colorado, myself, and other Senators 2 weeks ago.

The great problem we face is getting younger officers into the service. In fairness to men who could never otherwise obtain higher rank, it was deemed best to provide for the retirement of

some of the older officers. The laws for all the services were changed and liberalized last year in order to make them more fair for those retiring.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and I made short speeches several months ago urging that nothing further be done this year with respect to these retirement laws which affect all the services. We felt it wiser that the changes made last year be given an opportunity to see how they worked or how fair they were for those for whose benefit they were passed.

I do not mean to get into a long discussion, but that is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point I am making is that the subject ought to be studied. It is proposed that we retire by 1969 under the bill the Senator has mentioned, some 4,170 officers.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill with respect to the Navy, which was passed by the Senate the other day, will expire of its own weight in 1965, because the Navy has stated by that time it feels the problem will be solved. We want to be fair to those men.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that. I am not trying to be unfair to anybody. The point I am making is that the amount required to finance retirement pay seems to be skyrocketing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree.

Mr. ELLENDER. By 1970 it will amount to $2 billion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree. It is one of our great problems.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am only suggesting that the Committee on Armed Services, or perhaps some agency of the executive branch should look into the matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the appropriations committee does not take action until after the Committee on Armed Services reports a bill which authorizes action.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Then we consider the appropriations. I think the Committee on Armed Services should look into the matter, because it is serious.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In justice to the Committee on Armed Services, I wish to say that we have been studying the subject for the past 4 years. The chairman of the committee is the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I am sure he will substantiate my statement, because he is concerned, as all of us are, with this problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope some study will be made, looking toward reducing the amount. I do not know how to do it. It is an intricate matter, I am sure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is.

Mr. ELLENDER. Something ought to be done about it, because the amount of money is growing by leaps and bounds.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did not intend to take up so much time.

Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. BEALL addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the analysis to which I previously referred.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Department of Defense budget analysis, fiscal year 1960

[Dollars in thousands]

	Military personnel	Percent of total	Operations and maintenance	Percent of total	Procurement	Percent of total	Research and development	Percent of total	Construction authorization	Percent of total	Total	Percent of total
Army [1]	$3,699,724		$3,227,090		$1,407,300		$1,035,715		$218,125		$9,587,954	23.7
Navy [2]	2,564,700		2,611,220		3,860,063		1,015,920		185,451		10,237,354	25.3
(Transfers contemplated)					−281,600		+281,600					
Total					3,578,463		1,297,520					
Marines [3]	644,900		175,850		133,850						954,600	2.3
Air Force [4]	4,014,000		4,364,006		7,934,800		1,159,900		817,170		18,289,876	45.2
(Transfers contemplated)					−1,563,600		+1,563,600					
Total					6,371,200		2,723,500					
DOD, and others	[5] 715,000		59,201				605,000		[6] 4,779		1,383,980	3.5
Total	11,638,324	28.8	10,437,367	25.8	11,490,813	28.5	5,661,735	13.9	[7] 1,225,525	3.0	40,453,764	100.0

[1] Includes National Guard and Reserves.
[2] Includes Reserves.
[3] Includes Reserves.
[4] Includes Air National Guard and Reserves.
[5] Retired pay.
[6] Deficits in all services, prior years.
[7] Figures rounded.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain excerpts from Senate hearings on the fiscal year 1960 Department of Defense appropriations bills, including a table on page 627 and a colloquy I had with Mr. McNeil, which is printed at page 399 of the hearings headed, "Upward Trend in Retired Pay," which concludes near the middle of the page.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Actual and estimated new obligational authority, obligations, and expenditures for retired pay, fiscal years 1950–63

Fiscal year	Appropriation	Transfer	Total available	Obligations	Expenditures		
					New obligational authority	Balance of prior authority	Total
1950 actual [1]	$180,000,000	$19,700,000	$199,700,000	$198,060,374	$189,444,599		$189,444,599
1951 actual	342,000,000		342,000,000	324,089,227	318,350,025	$6,096,123	324,446,148
1952 actual	345,000,000		345,000,000	330,597,804	325,839,341	3,201,381	329,040,722
1953 actual	330,000,000	27,000,000	357,000,000	356,385,315	354,345,279	3,131,590	357,476,869
1954 actual	365,000,000	22,000,000	387,000,000	386,297,962	383,079,574	2,928,253	386,007,827
1955 actual	404,500,000	19,000,000	423,500,000	422,102,485	416,353,952	2,321,761	418,675,713
1956 actual	495,000,000		495,000,000	478,931,770	474,527,273	2,639,249	477,166,522
1957 actual	515,000,000		515,000,000	510,784,009	507,055,647	4,126,086	511,181,733
1958 actual	564,000,000	3,000,000	567,000,000	560,961,693	555,802,201	5,980,290	561,782,491
1959 estimate	640,000,000		640,000,000	640,000,000	634,000,000	6,000,000	640,000,000
1960 estimate	715,000,000		715,000,000	715,000,000	708,500,000	6,500,000	715,000,000
1961 estimate	832,000,000		832,000,000	832,000,000	825,500,000	6,500,000	832,000,000
1962 estimate	959,000,000		959,000,000	959,000,000	952,500,000	6,500,000	959,000,000
1963 estimate	1,109,000,000		1,109,000,000	1,109,000,000	1,102,500,000	6,500,000	1,109,000,000

[1] Excludes comparative transfer from:

Department of the Navy:	
Pay and allowances, naval personnel	$29,760,000
Pay, Marine Corps	2,145,000
Veterans' Administration:	
Air Force, Army, and Navy pensions	74,411,125
Total	106,316,129

UPWARD TREND IN RETIRED PAY

Retired pay will require $715 million for 1960, $70 million more than 1959. The cost of retired pay since the end of the Korean war has just about doubled. As I have pointed out in recent years, this sharp upward trend in retired pay may be expected to continue and even accelerate in future years as the World War II input of personnel becomes eligible for retirement. The $1-billion-per-year mark will probably be passed in the early 1960's.

Senator ELLENDER. Now what is that due to?

Mr. MCNEIL. The bulk of the people who retire at the present time, in the 1950 period, were in the Army, Navy, or old Air Corps of the War Department back in the 1920's and 1930's when all the services were small. Beginning in 1941, we had a big increase at the beginning of the war. Many of those people have stayed in right straight through and some of them become eligible for retirement, if they apply for it, beginning in 1961, after 20 years' service. Many of them won't, of course. They will stay longer. But I think there will be a considerable number who will make application for retirment beginning in 1961 and 1962.

Senator ELLENDER. You say that this retired pay will pass the billion-dollar mark in 1960?

Mr. MCNEIL. In the 1960's. I don't know whether it will be 1962 or 1963.

Senator ELLENDER. That is supposed to be the maximum?

Mr. McNEIL. No.

Senator ELLENDER. What do you figure the maximum will be?

Mr. McNEIL. I would say with the force at the present size, in the 1970 period it could run to $2 billion.

Senator ELLENDER. $2 billion for retired pay?

Mr. McNEIL. If you continue the present size force and get up into the 1975 or 1980 period.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I thank my friend the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I yield next to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee which held hearings on the bill for many weeks, I desire to commend the chairman for his fine understanding of the various issues involved in the controversies affecting national preparedness.

I wish to ask the Senator specifically what was done in regard to the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Moneywise, we have provided in the bill $137 million over the budget estimate. I cannot tell the Senator the total budget amount, because it is a classified item. However, I am sure the Senator can get the information from the committee.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In other words, as the result of the action of the House, of the Senate, and of the conference committee an additional amount of $137 million is being provided?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was added to the amount provided before.

Mr. DWORSHAK. For research and development and for procurement of the Nike-Zeus missile?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to my good friend the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to commend the distinguished chairman and the other conferees upon the decision they made in regard to this bill. The very life of our Nation is dependent upon our defense. Although this appropriation amounts to $39¼ billion, there is nothing more important to the Nation than that we maintain a strong defense.

I should like to express my appreciation, as one Senator, to the conferees for the fine job they have done.

Mr. President, when the bill passed the Senate we added some mandatory language with regard to the size of the Reserves, so as to be sure the manpower would be kept at 300,000. I understand it was not possible to retain the language in the conference, but I also understand that money is provided for a Reserve force of 300,000 and, further, that the conferees have received assurances from the Defense Department and from the White House that the Reserve Forces will be kept at 300,000.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico if that is a correct understanding.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct. While we were in conference I was called by a representative of the administration, and I made it a point to inquire about the matter. I asked the representative for whom he was talking, and he told me he was talking for the administration. I have his name.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We wanted to have the mandatory language, but, as is true with regard to any conference, we cannot get everything we want. We provided money for every one of the 300,000 Reserves, and we were assured, notwithstanding the fact that mandatory language was not provided, that an effort would be made to keep the strength up to 300,000.

Mr. THURMOND. Under the appropriation bill, as I interpret the language, the missile program will go forward and make progress. There is a provision to carry on the missile program?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Including the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. As well as the other type missiles?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. In the bill itself provision is made for flexibility. If there is a breakthrough in regard to any missile, irrespective of name, the Department of Defense has the authority to proceed, under the money we have provided.

Mr. THURMOND. And the ground forces have been increased beyond the recommendations of the administration?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, first I wish to congratulate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and then to say that the remarks I am about to make certainly do not apply to him, because he has been most cooperative.

Mr. President, I do not enjoy the role I am now forced to take—the role of exposing a wrong and the selfish reasons back of an affront to my State of Maryland and an affront to our Air Force leaders. I intend to ask my colleagues in the Senate to right this wrong. I am forced to take the floor to ask that the conference report on H.R. 7454, the Defense Department appropriation bill, be rejected in part, and that the Senate conferees be instructed to hold to the Senate's position in regard to the inclusion in the aircraft production program of the F–27, the turboprop transport plane designed to replace the famous old workhorse of the air, the DC–3. Although thought of as a Maryland product, parts of the F–27 are made in Oklahoma.

This item was struck from the conference report in a series of actions which speak for themselves. Possibly Senators can judge better what their decision should be in the matter of the conference report if they know exactly how it happened that the F–27 item came to be dropped. The significance of these simple facts is unmistakable.

In the bill as passed by the Senate, after long and thorough study by our Committee on Appropriations, there was provision for three types of planes to cost a total of some $59 million, as follows: $24½ million on the UTX, manufactured by North American of California; approximately $23½ million on the UCX, manufactured by Lockheed, also of California, and by McDonnell of Missouri—in view of what is to follow, keep in mind those two States, California and Missouri—and $11 million on the F–27, manufactured by Fairchild in Maryland and Oklahoma. This was the allocation of the $59 million which was agreed upon in the Senate.

The House conferees met, and, on general principles, agreed to hold out for a nominal reduction. How did they intend to reduce the total? On a pro rata basis, of course—cut a little from each of the three items. That was what they planned to do, by general consent.

But what happened? When the conferees of both Houses met, the $59 million for aircraft was taken up, item by item. First, the conferees took up the UTX, made in California; there was no opposition; the House conferees, all of them, voted with the Senate conferees for the full amount for the California plane. Next, the UCX, made in California and in Missouri; again full agreement for the full amount. It looked as though the House conferees had given up any scheme to cut the Senate items. Next the F–27, made in Maryland and in Oklahoma. And then, one of the House conferees brought up the idea that they had agreed to ask for a reduction of $10 or $11 million—"and would not the F–27 item of $1 million nicely fit the suggested reduction?"

"What about scaling down each of the three items?"

"No; the California and Missouri items have already been agreed to in full."

"What about appropriating an overall amount and letting the Air Force decide how it is to be distributed?"

"No; the California and Missouri items, already agreed to, might be cut to some extent."

The vote was taken. All Senate conferees voted for the F–27 items; the House split 3 to 2. Two House Members joined with the chairman in voting against the Maryland plane. And who are these two House Members? Why, one is from California and the other is from Missouri.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, would it interfere with the continuity of the address of the able Senator from Maryland as he presents the problem if I were to ask a question?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I would appreciate it if the eminent Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would address himself to the problem raised by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] in reference to the fact that the Senate conferees voted in favor of the Air Force purchase of the F–27, which is manufactured and assembled, at least in part, at Hagerstown, Md.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr President, every one of the Senate conferees wanted to

retain this item in the bill. It was only after hours of conference, and when we realized the adamant attitude of several of the House Members, that we yielded. There were House Members from all parts of the country, including California. They were extremely adamant. I am not questioning their motives. The Senate conferees tried to retain this item in the bill. We placed it in the bill in the subcommittee, in the full committee, and on the floor of the Senate. We certainly tried to retain it. We thought these planes were needed, and we had evidence from the Defense Department as to the necessity for this type of airplane.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator allow another interruption?

Mr. BEALL. If the Senator will wait a few moments, I shall be glad to yield.

The California and Missouri items were retained in full, but the House conferees became very saving when it came to the Maryland-Oklahoma item.

Our Senate conferees and two of the House conferees were united for the inclusion of the F–27, not only because the F–27 is needed, but also because its production in Maryland and Oklahoma would be in keeping with the overall defense principle of not centering our aircraft production in one area. As we all know there has been a great concentration of defense production in California, and this is not in the best interest of America. Any decentralization of such production is on the right side. The Hagerstown plant is ideally situated, tucked away in the mountains, about as safe as any location could be, and the Oklahoma plant is not in an industrial area.

We do not want our great production arm crippled by the dropping of a bomb or two dropped on California. I think the factor of decentralization is a strong one in favor of the production of the F–27.

Nearly $4 billion is being spent on military aircraft—that is 4 thousand million—and California is getting the lion's share of the production contracts; and yet its representative begrudges the comparatively small item of $11 million for Maryland and Oklahoma.

Of the $4 billion to be spent, all we ask for Fairchild is $11 million. Can Senators deny us this?

The F–27 is a superior plane. It is needed. Here, at Fairchild, is an established plant all ready to go; highly skilled and carefully trained technicians are standing by.

Officials of the Pentagon, military experts, experts in aircraft and in defense, top Air Force officers, all tell us that the F–27 is needed, that they want it. Yet, three civilian House conferees say no. They set themselves up as knowing more about our defense needs than do the Air Force and Pentagon officials; these three put themselves up as military experts who can brush aside the urgent advice of our key officers in the Defense setup.

There is another facet to the problem posed by the conference report. Members of this body are constantly giving attention to the matter of unemployment. The Hagerstown area will be affected seriously and adversely, if this conference report should be approved; and one entire community in Oklahoma will become a ghost town.

At a time when we are spending thousands of millions of dollars on military aircraft, and are deploring the scarcity of aircraft technicians, highly skilled and carefully trained technicians with Fairchild will be thrown out of work, and, with wives and children, will be queueing up for handouts of foodstuffs. Such a situation makes no sense at a time of high employment, when we are at work on a huge aircraft production program, and every facility and every trained hand is needed.

Why should the fine organization at Fairchild have to retrench while comparable facilities in California are expanding and preparing to expand on an even more tremendous basis?

But even more important than the economic life of this fine Maryland area and this Oklahoma town is the best interest of the Nation as a whole. Decentralization of defense production is important to our survival—and decentralization would be served by the inclusion of the F–27's in our aircraft program.

California is entitled to its just share, but is not entitled to its share plus Maryland's share, plus Oklahoma's share, plus the share of other States.

Can Senators vote against Maryland merely because we did not have a Maryland representative on the conference? Or against Oklahoma simply because no Oklahoma representative was on the conference? That would be setting a dangerous precedent. Is a State to be shunted aside and its rights neglected every time that State is not represented on a conference?

In the interest of fairness—for our safest national defense—and for what is best for all of us as Americans—I hope Senators will vote with me to reject the coonference report and to send our conferees back with instructions to insist upon reinstatement of the F–27's in the defense program.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is not the purpose of the chairman of the conference to pit one State against another. The reason why the subcommittee and the full committee in the Senate voted for this item is that it wac thought to be necessary. Let me tell the Senator what was before the committee with reference to the F–27. I am reading the justification on page 111 of the memorandum—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may request the yeas and nays, so that Senators may know there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the adoption of the conference report?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, is this vote to be on the adoption of the conference report, and in addition the motion to send the conferees back with instructions?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It will be on the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator from Maryland making a motion not to agree to a certain part of the conference report?

Mr. BEALL. If it is in order, I should like to ask for a vote——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection to the Senator having a vote; but on the question of adoption of the conference report, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I refer to page 111 of the committee memorandum. As I have heretofore stated, the subcommittee was interested in this particular item. Reading from page 111 of the memorandum:

> The Air Force testified that it has an urgent need to modernize its mission support type aircraft with newer models such as the F–27. Phased procurement over a 3-year period, of 29 or 30 aircraft such as the F–27, would permit the replacement of some of the C–47 aircraft currently in use in Europe. The proposed procurement would amount to only about a 1-percent replacement for planes in that category, i.e., C–47's and C–45's. The F–27 has a greater range, is faster, and carries a larger payload than the aircraft it would replace—the C–47. In addition, the F–27 is more economical, costing only 22 cents a ton-mile to operate, as contrasted with the C–47 which costs 56 cents a ton-mile to operate. Reprograming of fiscal year 1959 funds would allow an initial procurement of 7 to 10 F–27 aircraft and an additional $11 million is recommended for the procurement of 11 more F–27's in fiscal year 1960.

So there are plenty of reasons and justifications and much evidence indicating why this type of aircraft is a good aircraft, but we simply could not hold the item in conference.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. This plane is very necessary for replacement purposes. First, we are using as the workhorse of the European theater the DC–4 or C–54 and the C–47, which is the military version of the old DC–3. The motors are no longer made. Replacement parts must be made by hand. Service, maintenance, and repairs are costly. These obsolete planes are the only means of transportation in that theater, and they are very necessary. But they are costing the Government many, many times what new and modern turboprop planes, such as the F–27, would cost.

However, I do not believe we would profit ourselves to any degree by going back to conference and further insisting on this amendment. But I hope that those in responsible positions in the Department of Defense will take notice of what the chairman of the subcommittee and the junior Senator from Maryland have said, namely, that it is time we considered the maintenance and repair costs of the obsolete planes. They are bleeding us white in their operation, but still we are not getting any replacement aircraft.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico: Would it be possible, under the terms of the money previously appropriated for the aircraft program, where it is not specifically provided, if

there is any residual money left, in accordance with the appropriations language, to permit the purchase of some of these very valuable F–27 planes before Congress comes back, and before the regular supply bill is passed in about a year from now?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There are substantial funds available to make that possible. The department could reprogram money for the purchase of this type of plane. I understand that heretofore the Department requested such approval of the Senate subcommittee, and we gave that approval. But it appears that the Department could not convince the House Members. However, it is possible to do what the Senator from Oklahoma has suggested. There are funds available without increasing appropriations.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The well-informed comment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is appreciated. I may say to the Senator and also to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] that there is a definite measure of assurance in the colloquy in which they have engaged. They have set forth the intent of this body.

I think it is very important to realize that the F–27 is a good plane. Not only is it a splendid aircraft—it is a needed replacement for outmoded and high cost operational equipment. I have flown in the F–27. It is a turbojet which meets the most exacting requirements of expert manufacturing and reasonable maintenance.

Let us consider what the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] has explained. He has appropriately indicated that we are not setting one State against another State. But in the matter of the expenditure of $4 billion for military aircraft we have proceeded without logic, when an item of $11 million is refused for planes to be produced at the Fairchild plant in Hagerstown, Md. We come into a situation where we begin to realize that it is more necessary now than in the past to balance the manufacturing of aircraft.

I want to be objective. Some 700 or 800 West Virginians are said to be employed at present in aircraft production at the Fairchild plant in Hagerstown. There have been times when a much greater number of West Virginians were employed in that work. They come from Martinsburg, and other communities and areas of the eastern panhandle of our State. The Fairchild plant in Hagerstown has modern and needed facilities. It has trained and skilled personnel. Those facilities and those workers should be utilized now when the continued production of a plane meeting the current needs of the military is involved, as the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CHAVEZ] has well said. Senator BYRD of West Virginia and I were directly interested several months ago, in a conference on the necessity to keep this factory in effective operation.

I hope we will not overlook the fact that we have a real responsibility to further decentralize the production of aircraft in the United States. I would not attempt to disparage vital manufacturing which is being done in California or in any other State. Nevertheless, I think we can ill afford to allow facilities to disintegrate and manpower to be lost in failure to produce superbly fashioned planes at the site in the section of the country on which we have very properly focused attention.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The danger lies in what the Senator from West Virginia has stated. We will lose the productivity which is so essential. If the facility does not have any business, it will close shop, and then we are going to lose a facility which is actually needed if we mean what we say about national security.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Maryland on the able presentation he has made.

I want him, his colleague from Maryland, and the Senate to know, however, how far the Senate conferees to a man stood for this item, fought hard for it, believed in it, and that the remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CHAVEZ], and by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are correct, that the facility is needed. It is there, and it will be a sad day for this country when we have a complete concentration of production in a few militarily vulnerable centers. We need dispersed points of production throughout the country in various sections.

As the Senator from New Mexico has said, and as the Senator from Oklahoma has said, it is a product which is greatly needed, a replacement which is essential. The Senator from New Hampshire concurs in those statements and he hopes despite previous defeats that something can be worked out so that this productive capacity can be salvaged.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senate conferees agreed to eliminate the plane order for the Fairchild plant?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is something they were forced to do, after having had conferences with the other body extending over two weeks. A majority of the House conferees were adamant on this particular item, and so the Senate conferees submitted the report with this provision omitted from it. The Senator from New Hampshire signed the report with the exception of amendment number 27, which included the provision for the Fairchild F–27's.

Mr. FREAR. I noticed in the report of the conferees that there was an exception, and that was on the Fairchild F–27 item.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. What will be the effect of the elimination of the item from the conference report? I assume that the report is going to be agreed to?

What will there be to prevent the closing of this important plant in Hagerstown?

Mr. BRIDGES. I should think that unless they secure some other business or some similar business, this productive facility may be lost to the defense capability of the country. Some additional business is imperative if this plant is to stay in production. It is producing an outstanding product which is vital, and essential. That was the whole point of our position.

Mr. FREAR. Will the Air Force have to do without the planes which would have come from the Fairchild plant if the report which has been signed by the conferees is agreed to?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. Then they will be lacking needed planes. Is that the idea?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. The Air Force have as the Senator knows, 13 or 14 hundred of the C–47's, the old DC–3, which are obsolete and are growing more obsolete day by day, if that is possible. They wanted to sart a program of replacing them, starting, in a very modest way, with this type of F–27 plane. Now we will have to continue the use of the old planes and postpone further the replacement of obsolete planes.

Mr. FREAR. That was to be the subject of my second question to the Senator from New Hampshire. On the basis of what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has said, if I understood him correctly, it is going to cost the Government more to keep the DC–3's in operation than it would be to replace them with new planes.

Mr. BRIDGES. That would be true over a reasonable period of time because the F–27's can be operated on less than one-half the cost of the old planes, and can carry a far greater payload at over 100 miles per hour greater speed.

Mr. FREAR. That does not seem like very sound economy.

Mr. BRIDGES. Besides, the F–27 has been adopted by several of the feeder airlines of the country as the most economical plane available and no other is even on the drawing board. It is a plane which will fly in and out of small airports, for instance. It would be very successful in an area such as New England. We could use some of those modern planes in that area. Improved planes of this type are essential.

If the plant is not to be kept going, there is no incentive for a commercial airline to purchase these planes. They would have a spare parts and replacement problem.

Mr. FREAR. Of course, when the Senator refers to the size of the area, I suppose Delaware could be included.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. FREAR. I am not quite clear as to what the Senator from New Mexico said. Did he say that there were available funds in this appropriation bill which could be used for the purchase of F–27's?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Defense Department has money they can use for that purpose.

Mr. BEALL. In the 1959 budget?

Mr. CHAVEZ. They have the funds available but they will have to ask permission to reprogram, and it requires the consent of both Houses of Congress. We have given such consent, but I understand that the House refused.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, to answer the Senator from Delaware, there is $4,284,600,000 in the conference

report for aircraft procurement of the Air Force. That does not include these Fairchild planes, but they can be taken care of if the House would consent to a reprograming request. I do not think that could be done before the first of the year in any case, but it could be done.

Certain members of the Appropriations Committee of the House are very much against the purchase of this plane. They contend it is a very small amount, that it is not enough of a start, and they do not want to undertake it.

I concur with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. The Senate conferees were unanimous on the subject. They stood firm during 2 weeks of meetings. This was the last item in dispute, and we did everything we could, but very frankly I never saw a conference in which there was so little willingness to yield.

I think what is desired can be brought about by reprograming, for which there are funds available, from prior years for Air Force procurement.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator believe the money could be used now?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Presumably, by reprograming of available funds. I signed the report because I did not think we could agree on a report unless we yielded on this item.

Mr. FREAR. I do not question the sincerity and earnestness of the conferees on the part of the Senate, but if I gather correctly what has been said this afternoon, the Government is going to lose money because of excessive, costly repairs on DC–3's when they could get a better plane for less money by purchasing the F–27's.

Mr. BEALL. Let me read what the cost of operation is:

> The operating and maintenance savings which the F–27 enjoys over the DC–3 while in the performance of present DC–3 or C–47 functions and use, should be stressed. U.S. Air Force figures show a ton-mile cost of 22 cents for the F–27 while the C–47 ton-mile cost is 56 cents today.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. They were similar to the figures which the Senator from New Mexico quoted awhile ago. What I cannot understand is why the Government insists upon spending more money on old planes and getting less service out of them than it could obtain by purchasing new planes.

Mr. BEALL. I cannot understand that, either. The Air Force asked for the cheaper planes to operate, and the Senate tried to give it to them.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, since the $11 million for the purchase of these planes will be deleted and since both the chairman of the Armed Services Appropriations Subcommittee and its ranking minority member have expressed the view that it would be penny wise and pound foolish to fail to begin reequipment by the purchase of these necessary aircraft, if the motion of the distinguished Senator from Maryland to disagree to the conference report, with instructions, were rejected, would not and should not the House at least take judicial notice of the strong sentiment in the Senate regarding the need to begin the replacement of older aircraft?

Mr. BEALL. Yes, certainly.

Mr. President, it had been my intention to move that the conference report be rejected, with instructions.

But now that we have the assurance of the chairman of the subcommittee and the assurance of its ranking minority member, I shall not make the motion, because I am sure that the definite need for the F–27, as expressed here this afternoon, will cause the other body to proceed to consider the request of the Air Force for funds with which to procure the F–27's.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield again to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure the Senator from Maryland and all other Senators are aware of the fact that our workhorse plane of World War II was the DC–3, which is the present C–47.

The DC–4 became the C–54; and it is the long-legged workhorse.

It is also a fact that if during World War II these planes had not been in mass production, the United States' air strength would have been greatly diminished, and the likelihood of our Nation's winning that war would have been greatly lessened.

Mr. BEALL. There can be no question about that.

Mr. MONRONEY. Now, for the first time since approximately 1938, the American aviation industry has developed a workhorse plane which is a substitute for the old DC–3, which was laid down prior to 1935, and its design is now more than 20 years old. The aviation industry has not previously replaced the old DC–3 with a modern workhorse plane.

It certainly seems to me that it would be the ultimate of foolishness if, as a result of failure to provide $11 million, the Congress were to kill the production of this modern workhorse plane, which is so essential. After all, failure to provide the $11 million would really kill the production of the new plane, because the Fairchild Corp. has the franchise rights, from the Fokker Co., in Holland, for the production of these planes in this hemisphere. So such a failure by Congress to provide this means of putting the Air Force over the hump would also make impossible the use of the new planes by the feeder airlines, to replace the DC–3's, which have been in use for more than 25 years, for today no plane other than the F–27 is available as a replacement for the old DC–3's.

Mr. BEALL. That is correct; and I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his contribution.

Mr. President, following the assurance which we have received from both the chairman of the subcommittee and its ranking minority member, and now that the record shows very clearly the need for the F–27's, I withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Maryland has been withdrawn.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Louisiana Mr. ELLENDER] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—85

Aiken	Frear	Mansfield
Allott	Gore	Martin
Anderson	Green	Monroney
Bartlett	Gruening	Morse
Beall	Hart	Morton
Bennett	Hartke	Moss
Bible	Hayden	Mundt
Bridges	Hennings	Neuberger
Bush	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Butler	Hill	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Randolph
Cannon	Humphrey	Russell
Capehart	Jackson	Saltonstall
Carlson	Javits	Scott
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Case, N.J.	Johnston, S.C.	Smith
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Sparkman
Chavez	Keating	Symington
Church	Kefauver	Talmadge
Clark	Kerr	Thurmond
Cooper	Kuchel	Wiley
Cotton	Lausche	Williams, N.J.
Curtis	Long	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	McCarthy	Yarborough
Douglas	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Dworshak	McGee	Young, Ohio
Engle	McNamara	
Ervin	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—13

Dodd	Kennedy	Robertson
Eastland	Langer	Schoeppel
Ellender	Murray	Stennis
Fulbright	Muskie	
Goldwater	O'Mahoney	

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7454, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
August 4, 1959.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21, 34, and 38 to the bill (H.R. 7454) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further,* That the Army National Guard shall be maintained at an average strength of not less than four hundred thousand for the fiscal year 1960: *Provided further,* That $43,000,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses necessary to maintain the Army National Guard at the strength provided for in this Act."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 633. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense, should he deem it advantageous to the national defense to accelerate any strategic or tactical missile program, may transfer under the authority and terms of the Emergency Fund, an additional $150,000,000 for the acceleration of such missile program or programs: Provided, That the transfer authority made available under the terms of the Emergency Fund appropriation contained in this Act is hereby broadened to meet the requirements of this section: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Appropriations Committees of the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8 and 40.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INCREASE IN MAXIMUM OIL AND GAS ACREAGE LIMITATION, STATE OF ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6940) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, in order to increase certain acreage limitations with respect to the State of Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move the passage of H.R. 6940, which has been fully debated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] desires to make a motion to recommit. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is my understanding that the Senator from Colorado desires 5 minutes to address himself to that question. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator want the yeas and nays on his motion?

Mr. ALLOTT. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado may make his motion to recommit, and that debate on the motion be limited to 10 minutes, to be controlled equally by the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Alaska, and that, in the event consent is given, the yeas and nays be ordered on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The yeas and nays on the motion to recommit were ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May we have order in the Chamber, Mr. President?

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that we shall have a vote in 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Colorado may proceed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of all Senators who are present on the floor, because we have limited ourselves in regard to this matter to a very brief explanation.

First, Mr. President, I move to recommit the bill to the committee.

The purpose of S. 1855 is to promote the development of the oil and gas resources of Alaska by liberalizing the present leasing restrictions. I should like to read to the Senate what the Acting Secretary of Interior had to say about the bill:

> We recognize that oil and gas development in Alaska continues to be more costly and difficult than in other States. Nevertheless, we do not believe that a general increase of the acreage limitation as proposed by S. 1855 would be helpful or desirable.
>
> We believe that Alaska may be appropriately divided into two areas for oil and gas purposes. The land lying between the Brooks Range and the Arctic Ocean, that is, roughly the land covered by the present Public Land Order No. 82, presents a different problem from the rest of Alaska. There is little development in it at the present time and indeed there are governmental restrictions preventing development in most of this area now. However, that area appears to give promise for future oil and gas development albeit at even greater expense than in the southern portion of Alaska. Because of the extreme weather conditions and the difficulty of access, the special inducement for its development afforded by a separate acreage limitation appears to be justified. Accordingly, we recommend that the area north of the Brooks Range be treated separately from the rest of Alaska as far as acreage limitations are concerned, and that acreage limitations be established for that area alone similar to those now imposed on the whole of Alaska.

It was also stated:

> To permit a party to hold more than 100,000 acres under lease and 200,000 acres under option with no specific requirements for development would tend, we believe, to weaken the present motivation toward entering into such plans and contracts. This would be unfortunate, and, as far as we know, there would not be compensating advantages.

At the present time a person can have in Alaska 100,000 acres under lease and 200,000 acres under option, which is a total of 300,000 acres. By placing the acreage into a unitization agreement or under development contracts, the 300,000 acres can be built up as high as 800,000 or more acres. One company already holds in excess of 800,000 acres in Alaska.

The proposal in the bill would do away with the difference between leases and options. This is a meritorious proposal, and I support it wholeheartedly. However, the bill would also give permission to have 600,000 acres of land under lease and option in Alaska, which in my opinion would tend to create a monopoly in the southern part of Alaska. It would not help the overall development of the area.

Development is the purpose of the Mineral Leasing Act. The purpose is not simply to bring in revenue, but instead to increase the development of oil and gas throughout the entire United States.

Alaska will receive 90 percent of the funds from the rentals. I know my friends from Alaska are acting in good faith, but we have before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs some proposals to increase the rentals, which are now only 20 cents per acre, on the average, for the first 5 years. There are some proposals to increase this amount.

If we should now pass this limitation provision, and if great amounts of acreage are taken up under the proposal before anything is done to increase the rental fee per acre, it could conceivably cost the State of Alaska and the United States almost a third of a billion dollars in the next 10 years.

I voted to report the bill from the committee. I begged my friends from Alaska to agree to some amendments. This has been refused.

I only wish to say further to my friends, that I think the proposal as worded will be bad legislation. I think we can make it good legislation. I do not know what will happen to the bill if the Senate should pass it, but the Department of the Interior has expressed grave doubts about the proposal. I therefore urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). The time allotted to the Senator from Colorado has expired. The Senator from Alaska has 5 minutes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I will yield a minute of my time to the Senator from Colorado, if he desires to have me do so.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from Alaska has kindly yielded me 1 minute, if the Senator from Ohio would like to ask a question. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When was the formula established to fix the rental rate? The Senator from Colorado said that there is now under consideration the question of raising of the rental rate. If we should pass the bill, action taken now may not be consonant with what might be done in the future.

Mr. ALLOTT. I will say to the Senator that the formula was established in 1935. It was a 25-cent minimum for the first year, with the second and third years forgiven by statute. The first year rate was raised to 50 cents in the early 1940's and it remains 50 cents for the first year, with the second and third years forgiven. It is 25 cents for the fourth year and 25 cents for the fifth year; and 50 cents for each subsequent year, if the lease is extended.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The fact is, then, that the formula was established in 1935 and the rate has not been raised since that time?

Mr. ALLOTT. Except that the rate for the first year was raised from 25 cents to 50 cents.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But payments for the second and third year were forgiven?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I will only take a few seconds of my time to say that the essential difference between the position of the Department of the Interior and the proposal in my bill is that although both would permit the leasing of 600,000 acres in Alaska, which is an area where the cost of operating is 3 times as high as it is in the 48 other States, the Department of the Interior requests that 300,000 acres be taken north of the Brooks Range, which is the extreme north of Alaska, and 300,000 acres south of the Brooks Range. It is in my judgment absurd to make an issue on the basis of that difference and to attempt to kill the bill by recommittal.

The bill was reported unanimously by the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and unanimously by the full committee.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has all time been yielded back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado to recommit the bill to the committee, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A vote "yea" is a vote to recommit the bill, and a vote "nay" is a vote to reject the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado to recommit the bill. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS] the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—32

Aiken	Case, S. Dak.	Lausche
Allott	Cooper	Martin
Beall	Cotton	Morton
Bennett	Curtis	Mundt
Bridges	Dirksen	Prouty
Bush	Dworshak	Saltonstall
Butler	Hickenlooper	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Smith
Capehart	Javits	Williams, Del.
Carlson	Keating	Young, N. Dak.
Case, N.J.	Kuchel	

NAYS—55

Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Bartlett	Hennings	Morse
Bible	Hill	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Neuberger
Cannon	Humphrey	Pastore
Carroll	Jackson	Proxmire
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Church	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson
Clark	Jordan	Russell
Douglas	Kefauver	Smathers
Ellender	Kennedy	Sparkman
Engle	Kerr	Symington
Ervin	Long	Talmadge
Frear	McCarthy	Thurmond
Gore	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Green	McGee	Yarborough
Gruening	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Hart	Magnuson	
Hartke	Mansfield	

NOT VOTING—11

Dodd	Langer	Schoeppel
Eastland	Murray	Stennis
Fulbright	Muskie	Wiley
Goldwater	O'Mahoney	

So Mr. ALLOTT's motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 6940) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO DELEGATE JOHN A. BURNS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on yesterday the junior Senator from Alaska paid a well-deserved tribute to Delegate BURNS, of Hawaii. I was necessarily absent at the time, but certainly desire to join in such tribute.

In the rough-and-tumble game of politics, sacrifices are often made to insure the realization of a goal. The career of the Delegate from Hawaii is a shining example of this point.

JACK BURNS set out to do two things. First, he directed the strategy and provided the around-the-clock leadership which brought about the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State in the Union. Secondly, in the face of almost insurmountable odds, he threw himself into the task of rebuilding the Democratic Party in Hawaii. That his efforts paid off can be seen in the results of the recent election when our new State chose a Democratic Senator and a Democratic Representative.

In devoting his time and efforts toward achieving these two goals, JACK BURNS found it humanly impossible to give equal drive to his own campaign for Governor of the State he had helped to create.

By no means, Mr. President, do I imply any disparagement of JACK BURNS' successful opponent. But I do wish to state for the RECORD that here we have a case where a man has purposely submerged his own political desires for two causes he deemed to be more important.

Whatever the future political fates hold in store for JACK BURNS, I am sure that history will record him as a true statesman—selfless, tireless, and unswervingly dedicated to the principles he so ably espoused.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 563, Senate bill 747.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 747) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands known as the Des Plaines Public Hunting and Refuge Area to the State of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had

been reported by the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) subject to the provisions of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, and section 3, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey, by quitclaim deed, to the State of Illinois, for wildlife conservation or recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described lands, together with all buildings and improvements thereon, situated in Will County, Illinois:

All that part of fractional sections 29, 32 and 33, township 34 north, range 9, east of the third principal meridian, in Will County, Illinois, described as follows: Beginning at a point of intersection of the west line of Route 66 (Federal Aid Route 77), as monumented and fenced and a line 1,000 feet south of and parallel to the north line of said section 33 (said point of intersection is 167.4 feet west of the east line of said section 33); thence south 885 feet; thence south 4 degrees 1 minute 10 seconds west 2,961.68 feet; thence south 00 degrees 15 minutes 20 seconds west 416.81 feet; thence south 1 degree 2 minutes 40 seconds west 33.42 feet to the south line of said section 33, all of the above dimensions taken on the westerly line of said Route 66 as monumented and fenced (said last point is 352.7 feet west of the southeast corner of said section 33); thence west along the south line of said section 33 and fractional section 32, 10,082.43 feet to the southwest corner of said fractional section 32; thence northerly along the west line of said fractional section 32, 4,486 feet more or less to the southeasterly edge of the Des Plaines River; thence northeasterly along the southeasterly edge of said river to a point on a line described as follows: (Beginning at a point of intersection of the west line of Route 66 and a line 1,000 feet south of the north line of said section 33; thence westerly along a line 1,000 feet south of and parallel to the north line of said section 33 and fractional section 32, 5,300 feet; thence northwesterly along a line forming an angle of 115 degrees with said parallel line from east around north to northwest 4,800 feet more or less, to the southeasterly edge of the Des Plaines River); thence southeasterly along the previously described line 4,800 feet to a point on a line 1,000 feet south of and parallel to the north line of said section 33 and fractional section 32, said point being 5,300 feet west of the west line of said Route 66; thence easterly along a line 1,000 feet south of and parallel to the north line of section 33, 5,300 feet to the place of beginning (excepting therefrom those portions lying along said river as deeded to the State of Illinois and recorded in the recorder's office as document numbered 414965, book 691, page 31; document numbered 414965, book 691, page 34, and document numbered 414965, book 691, page 35; also excepting those portions deeded to John Flom and recorded in the recorder's office as document numbered 458161, book 759, page 38; also excepting that portion deeded to Three Rivers Yacht Club and recorded in the recorder's office as document numbered 695487, book 129, page 625; also excepting therefrom that portion deeded to Robert Berglund and Hugh Black and recorded in the recorder's office as document numbered 846871, book 1698, page 303; also excepting that portion included within the lines measured 100 feet outward from the existing high bank on both sides of Grant Creek Cutoff and Grant Creek) containing 946 acres more or less.

(b) The conveyance authorized to be made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be conditional upon the payment by the State of Illinois to the Administrator of General Services as consideration for such conveyance of the sum of $286,638.

(c) The land authorized to be conveyed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be conveyed subject to such easements for railroad rights-of-way as shall, in the determination of the Administrator of General Services, be necessary or appropriate to provide railroad service for the purchasers of adjoining tracts of land from the United States.

(d) The instrument of conveyance authorized by this section shall expressly require (1) that in the event the property conveyed by such instrument ceases to be used for wildlife conservation or recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest therein shall immediately revert to the United States to be held in the same manner as it was held prior to such conveyance; and (2) that the reversionary interest of the United States, at the request of the State of Illinois, be relinquished to such State by the Administrator of General Services upon payment to the United States of the fair market value thereof at the time of relinquishment.

(e) The property authorized to be conveyed pursuant to subsection (a) of this Act has been declared to be surplus to the needs of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) Subject to the acquisition by the State of Illinois of the property described in the first section of this Act, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2662 of title 10 of the United States Code, to convey, by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Illinois, for wildlife conservation or recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described lands, together with buildings and improvements thereon, situated in township 33 north, range 9, east of the third principal meridian, Will County, Illinois, containing 1,500 acres, more or less:

All of section 4;

All of section 5;

All of section 8 lying north of the Kankakee River; and

All of section 9 lying north of the Kankakee River.

(b) The instrument of conveyance authorized by this section shall (1) reserve to the United States all oil, gas, and mineral rights in the property; (2) reserve such improvements, rights-of-way, easements, and other interests as the Secretary of the Army determines should be retained in the public interest; and (3) contain provisions expressly requiring that (A) in the event the property conveyed by such instrument ceases to be used for wildlife conservation or recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest therein shall immediately revert to the United States to be held in the same manner as it was held prior to such conveyance, and (B) whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this section is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including all buildings and improvements thereon, for a period not to exceed the duration of such state of war or national emergency plus six months, and upon the termination of such use by the United States, the property shall be returned to the State of Illinois, together with all buildings and improvements thereon.

SEC. 3. The authority contained in this Act shall expire one year from the date of enactment of this Act if the State of Illinois has not, during such one year period, made commitments, satisfactory to the Administrator of General Services, with respect to the acquisition by such State of the property authorized to be conveyed under the first section of this Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate deals with the conveyance of some 2,400 acres of land in the Joliet Arsenal to the State of Illinois for wildlife conservation and recreational purposes. The Army originally purchased some 43,000 acres in connection with the Joliet Arsenal. That was far more than was needed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader. The very important bill which is before the Senate will, I think, involve considerable debate. I should like to know the pleasure of the majority leader as to the proceedings for the remainder of the day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am about to have drafted a unanimous-consent proposal which I wish to submit in connection with another matter. I had suggested the absence of a quorum until I could get the proposal drafted.

I was reminded by another Senator that the Senator from Illinois desired to make a statement, and that he could begin his statement while the draft of the unanimous-consent proposal was being completed. So I asked the Senator from Illinois if he would make his statement and use the time of the Senate, and then yield to me when the unanimous-consent proposal was ready. He agreed to do that.

I have no intention of seeking to have any other votes tonight. The unanimous-consent proposal may provoke a controversy. If it does, a rollcall may develop. I do not say that it will. But I do not anticipate taking any action on this bill tonight, and I anticipate no other discussion than the statement which the Senator from Illinois cares to make.

Mr. MORSE. I express my apology to the majority leader. I did not hear that colloquy because there was so much confusion on the floor of the Senate following the last vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That colloquy did not take place on the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Army, as I have said, purchased some 43,000 acres in connection with the Joliet Arsenal, much more than was needed. After the war, the State of Illinois leased 2,400 acres along the Des Plaines River for a wildlife, game preservation, and hunting preserve.

Last year the Army released these 2,400 acres as surplus, and the General Services Administration asked for bids upon it. Industrial concerns offered approximately $1,300,000 for the 2,400 acres and announced that they intended to build factories along the Des Plaines River.

Since there is so little recreational area around Chicago, I then introduced a bill to turn the 2,400 acres over to the State of Illinois, to be used for this purpose. The State of Illinois then proposed a compromise, to allow 1,500 of the 2,400 acres to be used for industrial purposes along the Des Plaines, and for the southern 900 acres to be used as a game preserve and wildlife conservation area. At the suggestion of local conservation groups and the State administration, I agreed that in addition to the 900 acres, another 1,500 acres directly to the south and adjoining the Kankakee River be added to the wildlife, conservation area, to make up for the 1,500 acres to the north which were being taken for industrial purposes.

I informed the State that it would not be possible to have an outright donation of this land to the State; and I was certain the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would object to such an outright donation and would insist upon the application of the Morse formula. I stated that I personally agreed with the principle of the Morse formula and that at least half the value of the land should be paid by the local authorities to whom the transfer was proposed.

The Governor of Illinois then proposed in his budget an appropriation of $286,000 as compensation for the land which was to be transferred.

This appropriation was passed by the State legislature and is available, as I understand it. The State of Illinois is ready to pay $286,638.

As I understand it, the difference between the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Illinois is simply a matter of the definition of what the "value" of the land is. I believe in the principle of the Morse formula. I think the Senator from Oregon has performed a great public service in insisting that half the value be met by the State or the localities. This prevents a raiding of the public domain. The question is, What is the "value" upon which this half will be computed? I had assumed that the basis of valuation would be the original cost or the cost of acquisition. I can give those figures. On the northern 2,414 acres, the total acquisition cost for the land was approximately $343,000, or, to be precise, $342,700.

There was an acquisition cost of $172,400 for the improvements, but all of these improvements were on the 1,500 acres, which are now being used for industry. So of the southerly 946 acres, the average per acre cost was $141.

The U.S. Engineers have advised us today, that the acquisition costs of the 1,500 acres to the south, which are being substituted for the 1,500 acres to the north, were $245,500, or an average per acre cost of $163.

The acquisition costs of the total 2,446 acres, therefore, will come to $378,886, or an average per acre cost of $172.

The State of Illinois will pay $286,638. So on the basis of cash payment the State of Illinois is ready to spend approximately 75 percent of the land acquisition cost, and, in addition to that, during the period it was leasing the property it made improvements on the northern 2,400 acres amounting to a minimum of $300,000, and which the State Director of Conservation claims to be $500,000. Some of this State expenditure was in the form of buildings and ponds, which could not be used, but some of it was in the form of roads and improvements in the southerly 900 acres of the original lot. So if this is counted in, the State of Illinois will pay well over 80 percent of the original cost of acquisition.

As I understand, the Senator from Oregon has maintained that the return should be 50 percent of fair market value—namely, what it could bring on the market—but since the Army acquired the land there has been a great increase in the value of real estate, particularly in the area along the Des Plaines River. As I have said, General Services received a bid of approximately $1.3 million for 2,414 acres, which would be at the rate of over $500 an acre.

As I understand, the General Services Administration is not satisfied with this bid, and is going to ask for additional bids. It believes that the northern 1,500 acres are worth $2 million, and that would be at the rate of $1,300 an acre.

This is an utterly impossible price for any local government to meet. It is just more than the local government can stand, even if it pays only one-half.

If this interpretation is accepted, and I hope it will not be, we might as well call the proposal off. There are technical difficulties, as well, like the necessity for formal reappraisal, which would be time consuming; but taking the industrial value of the land would alone kill the transfer.

As I see it, the fundamental issue is whether the local governments are to be compelled to pay the increase in land values which have occurred since the Army originally acquired the land. That is really the issue, and I hope that we can take original cost of acquisition as the basis for valuation.

I conclude by saying that I do believe in the Morse formula, but I think it should be based on original acquisition cost, at least if the original acquisition was in the recent past. I would not go back to 1800, but I think it is proper to go back to 1941 when this land was purchased. As a matter of fact the State is ready to pay 75 percent of its original cost of the land and if its price investments are excessive then it is paying over four-fifths of the original value. So if the 50 percent shown is taken as a guide, the State is recognizing and is willing to pay for some of the increase in land values. But it cannot bear the full load.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Morse formula is not the law, but at least the Senator from Oregon attempts to make it the law, and in some respects he probably should prevail.

The question I had in mind is, What would the Senator make the cut-off date? I know that many citizens in Louisiana, and certainly the State, would like to get back a great deal of land they sold to the Federal Government back in the depression days for $3 an acre, which I imagine now would sell for $40 or $50 an acre. I wonder what cut-off date the Senator would suggest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not desire to lay down a universal rule. It so happens that I believe this land was acquired in 1941, so that in this instance we would have the cut-off date just prior to World War II plus some increases in land values then.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, what the Senator is saying is that he does not want to implement the Douglas formula.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I bow my head in obeisance to the Morse formula, but I insist upon a reasonable interpretation of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is there any condition imposed on this purchase which would provide that these lands would have to be used by the State for a wildlife refuge?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or for recreation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Or recreation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Otherwise it will revert to the Federal Government?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. That is found among other provisions on page 3 of the bill:

> The Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey, by quitclaim deed, to the State of Illinois, for wildlife conservation or recreational purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. That shows clearly that that purpose is involved, but it does not show that a reverted or a revision would be placed upon the title conditioning the use of the land to those purposes only.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is found in section 2 on page 6 of the bill, "for wildlife conservation or recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest."

I also call attention to the top of page 6:

> The instrument of conveyance authorized by this section shall expressly require (1) that in the event the property conveyed by such instrument ceases to be used for wildlife conservation or recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest therein shall immediately revert to the United States to be held in the same manner as it was held prior to such conveyance.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Illinois. That certainly answers affirmatively my question, and to my mind puts this case in a much different situation from that in which it would be if the purchase were for general use and for fee simple title, to enable the State to dispose of the property in any way it wished.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I quite agree.

Mr. HOLLAND. Second, is it not a fact that the Federal Government itself is dedicated to a program of wildlife conservation, and has wildlife refuges in the same part of the country?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. So if the land is confined to the use stated in the bill, Illinois would, in effect, be cooperating with the Federal Government in a continuing program of great usefulness to the people of the Nation, and one which is recognized as such. Is not that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. As a matter of fact, the Kankakee River is a flyway for birds, and, indeed, is used as

a refuge for birds on the wing from the north to the south.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask a practical question: Is it not a fact that the Kankakee River flyway is a part of the great Mississippi River flyway from the north to the south, by which wild fowl migrate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Let me say that I think those facts constitute this case as one to which there is a very real difference as compared to the ordinary case in which the purchase is for fee simple, for use for any purpose, and not particularly for the furtherance of a common purpose in which the States and the Federal Government are engaged in cooperation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Florida. His suggestions have been very helpful.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, Mr. President; I shall gladly yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], who worked on the bill as a member of the subcommittee, and who knows the situation very thoroughly, indeed.

Mr. GRUENING. I was a member of a subcommittee of two which was appointed by the chairman of the full committee. The other member is the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], who now is absent on official business. However, the subcommittee actually had three members, rather than only two; the third member was the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for throughout our entire deliberations we felt the presence, at least in spirit, of the Senator from Oregon in his advocacy of the Morse formula. We are very conscious of that, and we approved of applying the Morse formula, and we felt we had done so. If my colleague and I had not felt that we had done so, we would not have reported the bill favorably.

I hope the Senator from Oregon will agree that not only did we aspire to apply the Morse formula, of which we highly approve, but we actually succeeded in applying it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall make only a brief statement on this matter tonight. On tomorrow, I shall make a longer statement.

But tonight I should like at least to outline the points I shall make in connection with my position on this matter.

Mr. President, it pains me ever to find myself in disagreement with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. My regard for him is very high, and my respect for him as a great teacher and a great economist is almost beyond description. Therefore, when I find myself in disagreement with him, I study long and hard, to make absolutely sure that I am correct.

After that long study, I reached the conclusion that the Senator from Illinois like all the rest of us, too, is human, and once in awhile makes a mistake. This is one of his few mistakes; but I believe it is so serious a one that I must oppose him here on the floor, in connection with this bill.

I have a similar high regard for my good friend, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. I am only sorry that his speech has proved what a poor teacher I am, because obviously I did not teach him well in regard to the Morse formula if he says I was present in spirit at least, as they worked on this bill, because from the committee report it is obvious that I failed to get across to them the meaning of the Morse formula.

So tonight I shall try very briefly—and on tomorrow I shall do so at greater length—to present my position on this matter, because I shall continue to try to protect what I believe are the desirable objectives of the so-called Morse formula.

I would that it did not bear my name; I would that it had some other name, so it would not be connected with any individual, as such. It would be much better to call it the so-called surplus property disposal policy which usually is followed in the Senate, and always is followed in the Senate during the consideration of measures on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, although sometimes is set aside when a bill is brought up for consideration on motion. But, interestingly enough, since 1946, such actions have occurred only rarely. Certainly I hope this instance will not be another of them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know the Senator from Oregon puts principle above everything else. I wonder whether he will be willing to consent to have the vote on this measure taken tonight.

ISSUANCE OF BONDS BY THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me? I have a unanimous-consent request to propose; and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may yield to me, with the understanding that, in doing so, he will not lose the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I yield, with that understanding and under those circumstances.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the House has passed House bill 3460, to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes.

Senate bill 2471, which has the same title, has been reported by the Public Works Committee; and that bill is an amendment to House bill 3460.

I have talked to those from the TVA area who are interested and to all Senators who have an interest in the bill, so far as I know. I have also talked to the minority leader. All of them have concluded that they would desire to have Senate bill 2471 passed, if it were called up in the Senate. Senate bill 2471 would strike certain language from House bill 3460.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when Senate bill 2471 is called up in the Senate, there be not to exceed 1 hour for debate on that bill, with the time to be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask whether any points of order will be waived if the pending request is agreed to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 747) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands known as the Des Plaines Public Hunting and Refuge Area to the State of Illinois.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; and in this connection I request the attention of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that I was scheduled to go to New York, tomorrow to open the hearings on the New York money market for the Joint Economic Committee.

The Senator from Oregon has said that he will speak briefly tonight on this measure, and that he will speak on it at greater length tomorrow.

Knowing the Senator from Oregon, and inasmuch as he has said he will speak at greater length tomorrow, I rather anticipate that there is a possibility that at that time he will make a very extended speech.

So, in a sense, I am throwing myself publicly on the mercy of the Senator from Oregon—as I have previously done privately—to ask whether he will be willing to let this measure be voted on during the next hour, this evening. I have taken approximately 10 minutes, I believe, to explain my point of view. The issue involved is not a complicated one.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the majority leader, I shall say now, in the Chamber, although I would just as soon say it in the cloakroom; but inasmuch as the point has been raised on the floor, I shall reply to it here—that certainly I do not want to prevent the Senator from Illinois from opening the hearings in New York, tomorrow. He said he would be willing to cancel them, but I do not want that to be done.

I should like to ascertain from the able majority leader whether we can reach an understanding that when the Senator from Illinois returns from New York, as soon thereafter as whatever measure is then the pending business is disposed of, the Senate will resume its consideration of this measure.

Frankly, the situation, insofar as I am concerned, is as follows: I am going to discuss this bill at some little length

tomorrow when we return to it—I would say for 3 or 4 hours—because it has many implications. I do not wish to be in the position here tonight of seeming to be uncooperative with one of the best friends I have, but I have my record to make, too.

It so happens I went to the majority leader late yesterday afternoon and spoke to him. He said to me he could make no commitment and would make no commitment, but it was not his plan to have a session tonight. In fact, I think he announced on the floor of the Senate today it was not his plan to have a session tonight. But the majority leader always makes clear, when he speaks to us in a matter of this kind, that he is not a free agent in the sense that he can guarantee what will happen in the Senate. I asked him if he was planning to have a session tonight, and he said he was not, with the result that I made some commitments for tonight which it would be rather difficult for me to cancel, although I could do that rather than inconvenience the Senator from Illinois, who has official business tomorrow. My commitment tonight is not on official Senate business.

Therefore, I should like to ask the majority leader to enter into a gentlemen's understanding that when the Senator from Illinois returns from New York and we finish the then pending business, we will take up, as the next item of business, this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts and I were discussing a parliamentary situation which might occur some days ahead.

As I understand the situation, the Senator from Illinois desires to be away from the Chamber, the Senator from Oregon desires to accommodate him, and I am anxious to please both of them. What they want the majority leader to do is bring up by motion Senate bill 747 some time after the Senator from Illinois returns. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. My specific suggestion was that we have a gentleman's understanding among us that when the Senator from Illinois returns from New York and we finish whatever is the then pending business, we proceed to consider this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will not agree to that. I will agree to call the bill up by motion as soon after the Senator from Illinois gets back as possible. I would not want to give that bill priority over other matters. I will agree to call the bill up by motion as soon as possible.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I recall the old aphorism, "Bitter, indeed, are the chastisements of a friend." The Senator from Oregon is one of the best friends the Senator from Illinois has. This bill is very close to the heart of the Senator from Illinois. Yet the Senator from Oregon, from a high sense of duty, feels impelled to throw a roadblock in the way of its passage and states that he intends to discuss the subject at some length. We know what that means—it means at great length. So apparently we are balked from taking action on it tonight and are faced with postponing it to the indefinite future.

That reminds me of the action of another good friend of the Senator from Illinois, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], when the city of Chicago was pressing its claims for a greater flow of the waters of Lake Michigan. The junior Senator from Wisconsin said he had a 294-page brief he was going to read. It being the last night of the session, it killed that bill.

In view of the experience of the Senator from Illinois, I am not only reminded, in the case of friends, of the saying, "Bitter indeed are the chastisements of a friend," but also of the saying that "We can take care of our enemies, but Lord deliver us from our friends."

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I may say that there are friends on many sides of a subject. I call attention to the fact that the senior Senator from Michigan might also be placed in the same category in which the Senator has cast the Senator from Oregon. I think it is a mistake to get the Great Lakes water diversion bill mixed up with the pending proposition. I hope the Senator will not go too far into that subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was merely indicating how friendship does not seem to have anything to do with the high-minded but the mistaken attitude of the Senator from Oregon, and the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Since the Senator from Oregon has served notice he intends to discuss the bill at some length, which means, as a practical matter, we shall not be able to get a vote on it tonight, and since he has been successful in getting it put in cold storage for some considerable period of time, I am going to make an appeal to the Senator from Oregon that he has some bowels of compassion within him and be willing to discuss the bill at moderate length, because it is not an important measure so far as world matters are concerned. I took 10 minutes to explain our side. The Senator from Oregon is much abler. He could certainly explain his side in 10 minutes. Since he is abler, he could probably do it in 8 minutes. Making a prolonged speech on this bill is only gilding the lily.

Mr. MORSE. The only comfort I can take from what the Senator from Illinois has said is that on the Great Lakes water diversion question I happened to be on his side. We were together then. But as to his comment about friends, there is certainly no motivation of bitterness or personal opposition at all in the stand the Senator from Oregon takes on this matter. The Senator from Illinois and I are really discussing differences of opinion so far as concerns the facts, as we lawyers say, involved in this case. I want the Senator from Illinois to know that in me he has a colleague who will join with him in having this bill brought up upon his return from New York at the very first opportunity we can persuade the majority leader to bring it up. I pledge to him, in open session, I shall continue to say to the Senator from Texas, day by day, I hope he will find it possible to bring up the Douglas bill next. I think that shows my good faith. I will not be a party, I pledge to the Senator from Illinois, to seeking any dilatory tactics to prevent the bill from being acted upon on the Senator's return.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Oregon be willing to agree to a unanimous-consent agreement to limit discussion on the bill, when it shall be brought up, to 30 minutes to a side?

Mr. MORSE. No. I could not discuss it in 30 minutes, but I pledge to the Senator from Illinois the Senator from Oregon will not filibuster the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the Senator's definition of "filibuster"?

Mr. MORSE. A speech discussing the implications of the bill of 3 to 4 hours would not be a filibuster; and I sincerely think it will take me a minimum of 3 hours to discuss this bill, and probably 4, because in my opinion, if we pass the bill in its present form we shall set a precedent which will bring to an end any further meaning or application of the Morse formula.

I will say to the Senator from Texas, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned I want him to know it will by my urging, upon the return of the Senator from Illinois from New York, that the Senator from Texas find the first possible opportunity to bring the bill before the Senate, in accordance with his judgment as majority leader in carrying out his duties.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I assure the Senator I have no desire to delay action on the bill, or I would not have made the motion to consider it this afternoon. I am anxious to accommodate both of my colleagues. I will do so as soon as I can, after the Senator from Illinois returns. I do not want to say this bill will be the first bill to be considered after the Senator's return, because there may be conference reports to consider, or other bills of importance.

I think the Senate will be in session for some time yet, and I am sure we will find an opportunity to consider the bill. I am glad to give that assurance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement on the bill tonight, so that my statement will appear in the RECORD, alongside the explanatory statement already made by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, so that I may make two unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock, noon, tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISSUANCE OF BONDS BY TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when a motion is made to consider S. 2471 there be no debate on the motion to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendments to the bill not be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That a motion when made that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2471) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes, shall be decided without debate; that if and when taken up for consideration no amendment to said bill shall be in order; and that debate thereon shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 747) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands known as the Des Plaines Public Hunting and Refuge Area to the State of Illinois.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make only a brief statement tonight. When I speak on this matter again, I propose to analyze the committee report paragraph by paragraph, because I think a consideration of the committee report itself will sustain the position I shall take on amendments.

I should like to have the Senator from Illinois and the members of the committee know that I shall offer an amendment to the bill, and ask to have it printed and lie on the desk so that it can be called up in due course.

Mr. President, I am giving serious consideration at this time—I think it is only fair to the Senator from Illinois that I serve such notice—to the thought that after we have the debate on the bill, if we cannot work out an understanding among us which will improve the bill by protecting the principle of the surplus property disposal policy which I have sought to carry out in the Senate ever since 1946, I shall move to recommit the bill for further study and committee consideration until next January.

For reasons I shall set forth in my major speech on this question, I do not think, from the standpoint of time, it is of great importance that the bill be passed now. The bill could be considered next January, unless we reach some understanding with regard to the bill by way of compromise which will protect the formula during the course of the debate.

S. 747 would authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to convey to the State of Illinois approximately 946 acres of land for wildlife, conservation and recreational purposes. The State, under the provisions of the bill, would pay the Federal Government a total of $286,638 at the rate of $303 per acre for the 946 acres of land declared to be surplus. As to this parcel, the bill contains a provision under which the 946 acres would revert to the United States in case the lands should cease to be used for wildlife, conservation, and recreational purposes.

Section 2 of the bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Illinois, without consideration, approximately 1,500 acres of land adjacent to the 946-acre tract. The 1,500 acres of land would also be used for wildlife, conservation, and recreational purposes. The conveyance of the 1,500-acre tract of land would be contingent upon the State's purchase of the 946-acre tract. The bill contains the usual reversionary clause.

I wish to say for the RECORD, so that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] can consider it tomorrow, as he studies my statement on this matter, that the insertion of a reversionary clause in any particular land transfer does not in any way remove the applicability of the Morse formula to such land transfer. It needs to be kept in mind that the formula calls for payment of 50 percent of the appraised fair market value when the conveyance is for public purposes. If a piece of property has a reversionary clause attached to the conveyance, then the appraised fair market value would be considerably less than would be the case if there were a transfer in absolute fee simple.

Therefore, I could not quite follow the implied reasoning of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], when he raised a question as to whether the transfer contained a reversionary clause. It does, but it still follows that the Morse formula is equally as applicable as it would be in the case of a transfer in absolute fee simple.

There have been scores and scores of cases since 1946 in which we have applied the formula for transfers which contained a reversionary clause. In fact, Mr. President, though I am guessing now, I think it is a reliable guess that perhaps most of the transfers since 1946 have retained for the Federal Government mineral rights by way of a reservation clause.

In this particular type of transfer, the reversionary clause is one which would put the property back in the Federal Government if the State of Illinois, the recipient of the property, should cease to use it for the purposes for which it is being conveyed. Property with that kind of a reversionary clause has value, and the reversionary clause will be weighed by the appraiser when he appraises what the fair market value of the property is with that encumbrance attached to it.

Mr. President, as I have stated, the bill contains the usual reversionary clause, to become effective in case the land should cease to be used for wildlife, conservation, and recreational purposes.

The State of Illinois has been operating the above-mentioned area since March 29, 1948, as the Des Plaines wildlife and public hunting area through a permit granted to it by the Department of the Interior. The original authorization was for a 5-year period and was extended for another 5-year period ending in 1958. The property in question was originally part of the Joliet arsenal comprising 36,092 acres. In early 1958 the 946-acre tract of land was declared surplus. The remainder of the hunting area, consisting of approximately 1,500 acres, was retained by the Department of the Army. According to the committee report, the 1,500 acre tract is not surplus property.

The original acquisition cost of the property covered by the bill as originally introduced by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] was $615,-119. The bill as introduced by the Senator from Illinois would have authorized and directed the Administrator of the General Services Administration to convey to the State of Illinois, without consideration, 2,414 acres of surplus real property for the purposes I mentioned previously.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois introduced the bill in order to help stay the transfer of the full 2,414 acres for industrial purposes, and did not have at hand at the time the original acquisition cost of the land. The Senator from Illinois was always prepared to have the State of Illinois and the local authorities meet their proper share of costs, and so informed the local and State authorities, and urged them to comply with the principle that half the value of the land for recreational purposes should be paid by the State. He thought that had been done. I am sure the Senator from Oregon does not wish to convey the impression that the Senator from Illinois had his hand in the cookie jar, and removed it only when he was rapped sharply over the knuckles.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from Oregon understands that the position of the Senator from Illinois at the beginning was just as he now explains. He will see that I so understood as I proceed with the explanation of the bill, and its history, as brought out by the committee report.

In the meantime, the General Services Administration completed plans for disposing of the property by sealed bids. The property was advertised for sale on February 2, 1959. The bids were opened on March 16, 1959 with the highest bid on the property totaling $1,345,418.

At the request of the Senator from Illinois—at least, that is the advice we obtained from the committee—the Administrator of the General Services Administration held the sale of the land in abeyance until the Senate Government Operations Committee, which was considering the bill, could reach a decision as to the best way the property could be disposed of.

Let me make it clear that I think the Senator from Illinois, in making that request of the General Services Administration, carried out what was his clear duty. He certainly owed it to the people of the State of Illinois to seek to hold up action on the disposal of the property until there could be a thorough consideration of his proposed bill by the Senate Government Operations Committee. Each of us does something similar to that time and again each year, as we seek to serve the interests of our constituents; and it is quite proper to do so.

During the course of the hearing it was pointed out by representatives of the State of Illinois that the State has invested approximately $500,000 during the past 10 years in the 2,414 acres under consideration.

The fact that the State of Illinois has invested some $500,000 during its leasehold occupation of the property, in my opinion in no way justifies the argument that, therefore, that $500,000 expenditure should be taken into account when it comes to determining the amount of money which the State of Illinois should pay for the property at the time of its final disposal.

If one of us rents a house or farm for a fixed-lease period, and proceeds to make improvements on the property, we do so in order best to serve our leasehold interest. We have no right, in the absence of any agreement, to call upon the landlord or the owner of the property to give us credit for any improvements we make on the property. I think the record is clear in this case that any improvements which the State of Illinois made in this property were for the purpose of carrying out its leasehold interest.

It is indicated in the committee report that the State of Illinois might be willing to purchase the property in question at a reasonable amount of money.

I am speaking of the 1,500 acres in dispute.

According to the report of the committee, both the General Services Administration and the Bureau of the Budget oppose the enactment of this measure on the grounds that there would be a great fiscal loss to the Federal Treasury.

I emphasize this point because I think the Senate should know that it has before it a bill, insofar as disposal of the disputed 1,500 acres is concerned, in regard to which both the General Services Administration and the Bureau of the Budget have filed adverse reports. They have filed adverse reports on the bill because they think the bill would result in great fiscal loss to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support the arguments for the need for more wildlife conservation and recreational areas near Chicago and other great cities, so that people can take their families to such areas for relaxation and fun away from the cares of city life and employment.

I wish to make it very clear to the Senator from Illinois and other supporters of the bill that I come from a great State in which there are large expanses of wilderness area. There is still much open country. There are thousands upon thousands of acres of mountain areas, river basin areas, and wilderness areas, so that the people of my section of the country have easy access to areas which can be devoted to wildlife conservation and recreation.

I believe that the people in the great metropolitan area of Chicago are entitled to have, not what we can properly call a wilderness area, but an area in the category of a wilderness area—at least a conservation and wildlife area, within 45 minutes from downtown Chicago, which the committee report shows this property to be.

I say to the Senator from Illinois that I think we should not forget the fact that the citizens of Illinois are also citizens of the United States; and we should not forget the fact that the citizens of Illinois are taxpayers of the United States. They have contributed heavily, through taxes, to the development of wilderness areas and conservation areas elsewhere.

I am perfectly aware of what I consider to be a matter of social justice involved in this problem, and I wish to do what I can to serve the social justice right of the people of Chicago and of the State of Illinois, in that heavily populated area. But I think we can do it without, in effect, destroying the Morse formula.

Without mentioning any names, Senators now in the Chamber have come to me today and said, "WAYNE, are you going to yield on this matter, and then apply, as you have rather stubbornly applied in the past, the Morse formula to transfers in our States, bills concerning which we have not been able to call up for consideration?"

I must be fair to them, and I want to be fair to the Senator from Illinois at the same time. Therefore, I do not see why the State of Illinois should not pay 50 percent of the appraised fair market value for the total 2,446 acres covered by the bill.

Before I close, let me say, in regard to the so-called Morse formula amendment, that the amendment which I have submitted is the amendment which I always offer in connection with transactions of this kind, providing for payment of 50 percent of the appraised fair market value.

Let us keep in mind the important operative fact in this case. This 1,500-acre tract has not been appraised. We are talking in the dark as to the fair market value of the property, with the reversionary clause contained in the conveyance, as it would be contained. In fact, it should be emphasized that the 1,500 acres have not been declared surplus property by the appropriate Federal agency.

I have no right, as no lawyer before any bench has any right, to fail to take into account the case of the opposition and seek to do justice, as he sees justice, in the light of what he believes to be the important facts in the opposition case.

I say to the Senator from Illinois that in my judgment, under the proposal which has been put forward, it is quite possible that the State of Illinois has agreed to pay more for certain pieces of property involved in this instance than it would have to pay if the Morse formula were applied to the entire 2,446 acres.

I have no desire to exact from the taxpayers of the State of Illinois a higher price for any part of the land than the Morse formula, applied to it singly, would exact from them. However, the bad precedent involved in the bill in its present form is that if it passes the Senate in its present form, 1,500 acres will be transferred without consideration. It is so stated in the committee report. I do not think that fact is changed by saying, "Oh, but we are paying more for some land somewhere else, and nothing for this land."

As to the meaning of the Morse formula, I do not understand why I have been such a poor teacher on this point, as I stated earlier in my remarks, as to leave the impression with the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Alaska, or anyone else, that the Morse formula applies to the original acquisition price.

It never has, Mr. President. It has never been so applied since 1946. The Morse formula applies to the appraised fair market value of the property now, based upon its present value. If the property is to be used for private purposes, then 100 percent of its appraised fair market value shall be paid for it. If it is to be used for a public purpose, as in this instance, then 50 percent of the appraised fair market value shall be paid.

One further point: I have said, ad infinitum, it seems to me, over the years, on the floor of the Senate, that when a piece of property has become surplus, or when the Federal Government is about to dispose of a piece of property, that property belongs to all the people of the country. It is the value of the property which is being disposed of. If Uncle Sam has made a good investment in a piece of property 45 or 50 years ago, and the value of the property has increased several times, that has been an increase in the wealth belonging to all the people of the country. I see no reason why the people of Oregon or the people of Illinois or the people of any other State should get the advantage of the increase in the value of the property over the years, while the taxpayers of the Nation as a whole lose that increased value.

I know of no time when I have ever failed to apply the Morse formula. I think it is pretty well known in the Senate that the Morse formula, as applied in my own State, has caused me much sadness in the past 2 years. It has been partly the cause of political repercussions in my State which sadden me very much. But that is history. I only mention it in passing, because I refused to yield on the Morse formula in connection with the disposal of the so-called Lillie Moore property in Roseburg, Oreg. I took the position then that if it cannot be applied in Oregon, then I have no right to apply it anywhere else in the Nation.

It may be argued that there was a distinction between the Lillie Moore case in Roseburg, Oreg., and other cases based upon a memorandum which had been

prepared by the Library of Congress. Unfortunately the researcher in the Library of Congress used as the example of the exception for which he argued a case which was no exception at all. He used as an example the so-called veterans' hospital case of Roseburg, Oreg., which fell within the same class as other veterans' hospital cases; to wit, when property was donated, as it has been on various occasions, to the Federal Government for the purpose of building a veterans' hospital on the property, and for that purpose only, and more property was donated than was needed by the Veterans' Administration, then the surplus property always reverted to the donor. In such a case the Morse formula is inapplicable, for the reason that the property was donated for a specific purpose, with the understanding that as much as was donated was needed; and when it was found that all of it was not needed, the remainder automatically reverted to the original owner.

The Library of Congress in that instance thought that because such a rule applied to the veterans' hospital transfers, the so-called Lillie Moore property case was an exception. The Lillie Moore property case was one in which the taxpayers of the country, through the Federal Government, had an absolute fee simple interest in the property. Therefore any attempt to give it to the Douglas County Historical Society without consideration was a clear violation of the Morse formula. So I had to object, and I objected with great sadness. I regret very much that it has played the political part it has come to play in Oregon politics. But that is another matter.

However, if I am mistaken in my understanding of the facts of this case, the Senator from Illinois will find me exceedingly cooperative in trying to reach an understanding with him. I am desirous of working out with him a modified bill which will make it perfectly clear that no property will go to the State of Illinois without payment of consideration; and that the Morse formula will apply to every acre of property which transferred. But it may be, in regard to the consideration already agreed upon, that the State of Illinois is offering to pay more than it needs to pay under the Morse formula. If by lead pencil and paper that can be shown, the Senator from Illinois will find me very desirous of working out with him a modified bill.

My primary objection to the bill in its present form is that if it is passed, we will, in my judgment, be approving the transfer of some 1,500 acres without payment of consideration. The fact that other property is being transferred elsewhere in Illinois for a consideration does not, in my judgment, change the gratuitous transfer. I could not approve the bill with that language in it.

Then there are two other points I shall discuss later, not tonight. One is the question whether some other property near by, in the same Joliet Reservation area, might be used for this purpose. The committee report is to the effect that some witnesses testified it was not suitable for conservation purposes. I have been advised that there is some doubt about that.

Furthermore, we need to keep in mind the fact that apparently even this 1,500 acres includes great stretches valuable for industrial purposes. But I am willing to come to grips with that. From the standpoint of the national interest, I would not vote to put on the market a piece of property which would bring a high price for industrial usage, even though to do so would bring a considerable amount of money in addition to what the application of the Morse formula would bring, if I became convinced that the recreational, wildlife refuge, and conservation interests of the American people would be better served by setting aside the piece of land for such conservation purposes. Quite frankly I will not put price tags on the development of conservation, recreational, and, yes, cultural interests, because many other intangibles are involved.

How can we evaluate what this land will be worth to unborn generations of American boys and girls who will live in the area of Chicago, land within easy, quick access to the Loop of Chicago? This is an area to which they can go—and I am not being sentimental—to get a little closer to their Creator, as all of us always do when we find ourselves in the bosom of nature. I think that is worth much to the Nation as a whole, as well as to the people of Illinois.

With these views in mind, I think it ought to be possible for us to find an area of agreement in regard to this matter, an agreement which will protect a principle which, not because it bears my name—as I have said, I wish it might be called the surplus property disposal formula rather than the Morse formula—is very close to my interest. We should not overlook the fact that since 1946 the application of this formula has saved the taxpayers many millions of dollars in specific bills, and we do not know how many millions of dollars more because of the fact that bills have come to the floor containing this principle. They were bills which probably would not have contained the principle had their sponsors not known there would be a debate on it in its absence. We do not know how many bills were not introduced at all, which might otherwise have been introduced, because it was known that this formula existed and would be applied.

So I say to the Senator from Illinois, that after he returns from New York, he and I and his assistants along with my assistants should sit down and see if we cannot work out an adjustment of our differences on this matter that will enable us to pass a bill which does not do, as I think this one does, such violence to the Morse formula.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad the Senator from Oregon has closed on this conciliatory note. Of course we shall be very glad to meet with him and his staff and to try to work out a mutually satisfactory arrangement.

One or two corrections I think should be made in order that the record may be clear.

The objection of the General Services Administration was directed toward my original bill. When it was modified to substitute the lower 1,500 acres for the more northerly 1,500 acres, and when it was accompanied by the offer of the State of Illinois to pay $286,638, I am informed that the General Services Administration was and is in favor of the bill in its present form, although the Bureau of the Budget has not given its approval.

The lack of approval by the Bureau of the Budget does not worry me at all, because in recent years the Bureau of the Budget has, to my mind, adopted an unduly restrictive point of view.

There is another point which I think needs to be corrected. It is true that under the technical form of the bill at present, the $286,638 to be paid by the State of Illinois covers the northerly 946 acres, and it is true that it is stated that the 1,500 acres south of this is to be transferred without consideration. This may be a verbal statement, but it is not the real situation.

The first bids for the 946 acres in question amounted to $286,638, and so to date an offer to pay $286,638 was in reality an offer to pay 100 percent for that 946 acres.

This was, I may say, a commercial bid. The groups which bid $286,638 for the so-called parcel 3 were planning to use this land for industrial purposes. No bids have been received on the lower 1,500 acres and no appraisal has been made.

So we do not know what their present appraised value would be on the basis of sales price, but on the basis of original cost of acquisition the $286,638 is much more than half of the original cost to the Government of the full 2,414 acres in question and is indeed nearer 75 percent. If to this there is added the cost of the roads installed by the State the resultant figure is appreciably in excess of this amount.

The Senator from Illinois is perfectly willing to have this bill amended by a whereas clause making it clear that the lands which the State designated in the bill passed by the legislature and signed by the Governor, be considered not merely for the northern 946 acres, but for the entire 2,446 acres. I hope such a clause as that can be drafted.

But I come back to the point which is really in question, and that is whether we are to take as the basis for value the amount which land can bring for industrial or commercial purposes, or its value for recreational purposes. If it is insisted that the market test is to be applied, then very frankly I think we shall have to give up any idea of Federal land being used by localities for recreational purposes if the land lies relatively close to a great city.

It is simply one of the facts of life that industry will pay large sums of money for land on which it can make a profit, that it will pay larger amounts than taxpayers are willing to contribute for recreational purposes, and that if we put this land up to the highest bidder and say the locality must meet the bids of factories and large industrial concerns, then we are going to price the recreational values of this land

right out of the market and the local authorities will be unable to meet the price even at one-half the rate.

So while I appreciate the sincere statements of the Senator from Oregon that he does not want to deprive the 6 million people of the metropolitan area of Chicago of this 2,400-acre recreational area, if he insists that the appraised value for commercial purposes shall be the standard to which the 50-percent formula is to be applied, it means that we will not be able to use this area for the purposes in question.

I hope that issue is now clear and that in the interval which will elapse some solution may be reached.

Mr. MORSE. Before the Senate adjourns as previously agreed upon I desire to make reference to why I stated, as I did, that the General Services Administration would not approve the bill. I took that statement from the committee report. I do not find anything in the committee report, although I may have missed it, that indicates that the General Services Administration would agree to the bill in its present form.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will turn to page 5, the two last paragraphs, he will find that the Administrator of General Services testified that the original bill would involve a sacrifice of income on the part of the Government, and the original bill did not provide for any compensation, but in the last paragraph it is stated:

He—

Referring to the Administrator of General Services—

indicated that he believed that a compromise might be worked out under which two of the three parcels comprising the 2,414-acre tract might be disposed of for utilization for industrial purposes and the remaining parcel, comprising 946 acres of the least valuable land, might be sold to the State of Illinois at the reasonable fair market value for recreational purposes. He stated further that he was prepared to discuss the matter with officials of the State.

It is precisely this suggestion of the Administrator of General Services that we adopted in the amendment to the bill known as section 2. We adopted precisely that. We gave up the first two parcels of land to the north, comprising approximately 1,500 acres, and took instead the 1,500 acres to the south; and, instead of the State paying 50 percent of the fair market value of the 946 acres, it would pay a hundred percent on the basis of the industrial bid as of March 1959.

I am perfectly willing to have the language changed so that the two parcels of land may be considered as a whole. The point to which I object is taking the present industrial value of the land as the price which the State must pay in order to use the land for recreational purposes.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that in the staff conferences I have suggested I am sure we can reach an understanding as to what the facts are in regard to the General Services Administration, but I do not reach the same interpretation as he does of the language which he has read.

At the bottom of page 5 of the report, I find the following statement:

He—

Meaning the Administrator of General Services—

indicated that he believed that a compromise might be worked out under which two of the three parcels comprising the 2,414-acre tract might be disposed of for utilization for industrial purposes and the remaining parcel, comprising 946 acres of the least valuable land, might be sold to the State of Illinois at the reasonable fair market value for recreational purposes. He stated further that he was prepared to discuss the matter with officials of the State.

But that does not refer at all to the 1,500 acres which are in dispute, and for which it is not proposed that any consideration at all be paid.

At the top of page 4 of the report, the following will be noted:

By letter, dated March 24, 1959, referring to the bill as introduced, the Administrator of General Services advised the chairman of the committee as follows:

"GSA is opposed to the enactment of this measure because we are opposed in principle to the enactment of special legislation which has for its purpose the disposition of specific property when the disposal of such property could be accomplished in accordance with existing law of general application. If any portion or all of this property were determined to be chiefly valuable for wildlife conservation purposes, it could be transferred to the State of Illinois in accordance with existing law."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course that refers to the original bill.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that.

I read further from that part of the report:

The Bureau of the Budget advised the committee that it concurred in the views expressed by the Administrator of General Services on S. 747, as introduced, and opposed favorable action on the measure.

But the statements to be found on page 5 of the report do not refer at all to the 1,500 acres; instead, they refer to the areas to the north of the 1,500 acres, including the 946-acre tract.

But I believe that one of the differences between us is in regard to the 1,500-acre tract. I do not think the committee report, at least, bears out the statement of the Senator from Illinois that the General Services Administration favors the disposition of the 1,500 acres as he proposes. Perhaps it does; and I propose to find that out between now and the time when we have our staff conference. But in the committee report, I find nothing to so indicate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to prolong the debate; but the facts are that a conference was held on May 15, 1959, at which Mr. Floete was present as were a representative of the Governor of Illinois and the director of conservation for the State of Illinois; and the suggestion that the southerly 1,500 acres be substituted for the northerly 1,500 acres was Mr. Floete's suggestion.

My assistant, Mr. Brown, was present at that conference; and he tells me that that is so. Mr. Brown is a truthful man.

The present situation is that the Department of the Army already has 39,000 acres in this area, but does not want to give up the 1,500 acres to the south, and is proposing, instead, a totally unsatisfactory third 1,500 acres, approximately 1½ miles to the southeast, across from the main-traveled, north-south-traveled Highway 66. But the wildfowl could not move from one area to the other, and the people could not move from one area to the other.

The Department of the Army has so much land that it is virtually running out of its ears, so to speak.

I think the Department of the Army is pursuing a very selfish policy in this respect—one which tends to be typical of its land policy. In this case, it is attempting to "lock up" this land within reach of the metropolitan area of Chicago, and is attempting to deny the use of the land to the people of Chicago.

Certainly the Army could perfectly well conduct its maneuvers on the remaining 39,000 acres.

The Bureau of the Budget is backing up the Army.

We adopted the suggestion of the General Services Administration. There is nothing to indicate that the Administration has changed its mind in the meantime. But the Bureau of the Budget is standing between the General Services Administration and the Congress, to prevent any written document from being transmitted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senator from Illinois that I do not question either his report or that of his able assistant, Mr. Brown, as to the present position of the General Services Administration. However, I wish to point out that we have no documentation in that connection; and I wish to state for the RECORD that I think we should have documentation of it. So I want the Senator from Illinois to know that on tomorrow I shall address a communication to Mr. Floete, and shall call his attention to this debate, and shall request from him a clarifying memorandum.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that will be very helpful, because, very frankly, I feel aggrieved by the fact that after being pushed into one compromise by the General Services Administration, I then find myself more or less cut loose and without formal support from the group which initiated the compromise.

Mr. MORSE. I think I owe it not only to myself, but also to the Senator from Illinois, to request that an official position be taken by the General Services Administration.

Mr. President, as I close my remarks, I want the Senator from Illinois to know that I appreciate very much his objectivity and his fairness in the course of our debate regarding a problem on which I am very desirous of working with him.

PROCUREMENT POLICY OF THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as we are about to conclude the session for today, I wish to comment briefly on some of the debate which occurred this afternoon between the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and other Senators, in connection with the conference report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense.

It will be recalled that the Senator from Maryland and other Senators expressed great concern regarding the F–27 aircraft procurement. As I listened to that debate, I realized that it was a "script" which I have heard before, here.

This problem seems to be a recurring one. To me, it is symptomatic of something which is very basic, and suggests a need much more pressing than any which was commented on during the afternoon. This need is not peculiar to the State of the distinguished Senator [Mr. BEALL] who led the debate on that point this afternoon.

For myself, I realize and remember the concern which was Michigan's when a major tank procurement contract for the production of the M–60 tanks was moved from Michigan to the State of Delaware. At that time, a feeling of frustration was experienced by those of us who would have preferred to see the production remain in Michigan. That frustration was complicated by a realization that the security and, indeed, the very survival of the free world were involved, because military security is precisely aimed in that direction.

What guidelines do we have when we are faced with such a problem? Not only must we have real concern for the welfare of our respective States and the activities conducted in them, but we must also have sufficient appreciation of the national considerations involved to realize that our States' short-term interests may not be the same as the long-term interests of the Nation.

So all of us have to project ourselves beyond the boundaries of our own States, and we must seek to determine the impact on the economy of the entire Nation.

The economic strength of the Nation in the long haul will determine whether we shall succeed or whether we shall fail in this contest in the 20th century.

I think the debate which took place this afternoon points up specifically the justification behind a resolution which I submitted last week. That resolution proposes the establishment of a Senate Select Committee on the Economic Impact of National Defense.

A very timely comment was written by Sylvia Porter, and was published in the Washington Star of July 30. I ask unanimous consent that her article be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Washington Star, July 30, 1959]

PRODUCTION PEARL HARBOR?

(By Sylvia Porter)

If the Army were to be hit by a "Production Pearl Harbor" this Sunday, it—meaning the Nation—would be worse off than the Navy was on that dreadful Sunday in December 1941.

It would take the Army more time now to get its military weapons into full scale production and ready to strike back effectively than it did in 1941.

In World War II it took 12 months to get tooled up to produce the weapons we needed.

If a new emergency were to hit next week or next year, it would take 30 months or more to get tooled up.

A study of the Army's production policies by a Johns Hopkins University team reveals, that, while the Army presumably has been inventing modern models for weapons, it has been utterly neglecting to develop modern machines to turn out the weapons.

It was in the July 27 issue of the American Machinist, the magazine for the metalworking manufacturing industry, that I stumbled across the data uncovered by the Johns Hopkins study. Specifically:

The average machine to produce weapons now becomes obsolete in five years. Prior to 1940 a machine's life expectancy could be figured at 15 to 20 years, but in this era of technological development a machine becomes out-of-date in a quarter of the time.

MACHINES OUTDATED

Nine out of 10 of the critical machine tools for the Army's industrial production were built either in World War II or during Korea.

Almost 3 out of 5 of the critical machine tools are in storage—put away on the theory that if needed, they can be assembled and placed in operation quickly. This theory the John Hopkins study challenges.

The costs of producing military items are becoming prohibitive because of the rapid deterioration in the efficiency of obsolete machines, and the United States is lagging in the development of new items because of its out-of-date production equipment.

While we are complacent about this, Russia's attitude is precisely the opposite, and the Soviet Union has gone on record with the belief that new equipment must be replaced within 10 years or the "introduction of new technology will suffer intolerable delays."

While "advanced technology is available" to us, we are not using it and as a result, "we are rapidly losing the advantages in technology that we have had for many decades."

EXPLANATION SOUGHT

At this point I reached for the phone to call Burnham Finney, editor of the American Machinist to ask, "Why is this happening?"

"The explanation, I suppose is the belief that any war would be one of those '7-day affairs,'" Mr. Finney replied, "and thus it would all be over before the machines were needed. But how do we know this is the way it will be? How can we be so indifferent to other possibilities?"

"What would it cost to modernize the equipment?"

"A drop in the bucket. A mass modernization program, involving the purchase of 5,000 to 6,000 new machines of advanced design would cost only around $75 million a year over the years ahead."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, to the same point, there appeared an article by the editor of American Machinist in that McGraw-Hill publication of July 27, entitled "Can We Prevent a Production Pearl Harbor?" I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE PREVENT A PRODUCTION PEARL HARBOR?

(By Burnham Finney, editor)

If the Army is to develop modern weapons and produce them at the desired rate, and if it is to keep production costs within bounds that the Nation can financially afford, it must put into effect immediately a machine-tool modernization program. This program should encompass the purchase of 5,000 to 6,500 new machines of today's advanced designs, costing around $75 million, each year for a number of years ahead.

Beyond that, if the Army is to get the modern weapons its various assignments require, military procurement costs must drop sharply the next 5 years. The only effective way to achieve such savings is massive modernization of the Nation's metalworking production facilities, not only inside the Army's own operations, but in thousands of plants that have prime military contracts or subcontracts.

LEADTIME IS GETTING SHORTER

Unless such modernization occurs, so that today's advanced production technology can be applied to manufacture of weapons, the United States will lag in development of new military items (held back by available out-of-date production equipment), costs will become prohibitive because of the rapid deterioration in the efficiency of obsolete machines, and leadtime for machine tools in the next emergency is likely to rise to 30 months or more, compared with 12 months during World War II and 24 months during Korea.

Such are the conclusions arrived at in a study of the Army's machine tool policies by a Johns Hopkins University team, reliable reports say. If present policies continue, the Army machine-tool inventory will have so many obsolete machines by 1965 that it will be virtually useless for production of 1965 weapons.

MAY BECOME DOD POLICY

The Johns Hopkins study is said to have important implications for all three of the armed services and may well become a Department of Defense document, the basis for carrying out the DOD modernization and replacement program that has been pretty much bogged down since its start a few years ago.

The study's chief conclusion is: You cannot have modern weapons without modern means of production. To support this conclusion, the study is reported to recommend that the Army's machine tools be put into tooled-up plants which would be working on current requirements rather than be stored in so-called production packages or in warehouses. Almost all of the plants would be operating at a small fraction of capacity. The sustaining equipment in the plant (machines not employed on current production) would be in the ratio of 20 to 1 to the equipment actually at work. This ratio would be based on a two-shift operation.

BASED ON AMERICAN MACHINIST INVENTORY

Basing many of its projections on the 1958 American Machinist Inventory of Metalworking Equipment, the Johns Hopkins study is reported to advocate full modernization of the U.S. production system if U.S. world leadership—politically, militarily, economically—is to be maintained. Advanced technology is available, but not used. For that reason, we are rapidly losing the advantages in technology that we have had for many decades. The Western European countries, and Soviet Russia, are outstripping us in economic growth.

U.S.S.R. REPLACEMENT CONSCIOUS

Soviet Russia, in fact, is more sensitive to the dangers of machine tool obsolescence and what that means to the economy than is the United States, the study is reputed to point out. It has gone on record with the belief that new equipment should be replaced in less than 10 years from its installation date. If that is not done, introduction of new technology will suffer intolerable delays.

SIX-YEAR TOP PERFORMANCE?

The average machine tool can be expected to work with new machine tool accuracy for about 6,000 hours, the study states. Major preventive maintenance will extend its useful life, with new machine tool accuracy, another 6,000 hours. If the machine works on a 40-hour-a-week basis, its firstline performance will not be longer than 6 years.

FASTER OBSOLESCENCE TODAY

Under the impact of technological development, according to reports of the study,

machine tools have been becoming obsolete faster. Prior to 1940, obsolescence took 15 to 20 years. For years after that, it speeded up to 8 to 10 years. By 1960 it probably will not be longer than 5 years.

The deterioration cycle of machine tools has shortened for a number of reasons, two of which are of prime importance. First, new levels of precision involving 0.0001 inch are a different matter from percision levels of 0.001 inch. Second, the ability of today's machines to remove metal involves far greater stress than operation of yesterday's machines (and frequently is 5 to 10 times more than that of machines of 1949 design). Other factors, tougher metals now being worked, much more rigid cutting materials (carbide and ceramic tools), more horsepower. As the working of metal thus becomes increasingly an operation of high power and precision, the expected life of machine tools declines sharply.

TAX HAGGLING

Yet, the study reportedly comments, the U.S. Treasury still bargains with machine tool users, for tax depreciation purposes, on the basis of a schedule of expected lives (Bulletin F) that was obsolete 20 years ago. The Defense Department's schedule of useful lives is correspondingly obsolete.

Building block developments and automatic electronic programing will be responsible for profound changes in manufacture of both civilian and military products, the study is said to claim. The rigidity that has been characteristic of mass production in metalworking will begin to disappear as building block systems make basic redesign possible.

ENGINEERING-CHANGE LEADTIMES

Engineering changes are being made frequently in almost all complex military equipment. Modern programing methods will allow such changes with least disturbance and in a shorter leadtime. Spare parts can be produced in small lots for weapons without delay, thus reducing or eliminating the problem of large surpluses. Research and development will be speeded up by automatic programing (leadtime on a 1,000-horsepower gas turbine engine was reduced by 1 year). Best of all, automatic programing offers the possibility of designing directly for production. During the next 10 years many engineering concepts will be translated directly through punched tape or through cards to the production system.

MANY NEW TECHNIQUES

Military applications of new metalworking techniques now coming into use are potentially as numerous as possible industrial applications, the study reputedly points out. These techniques will make possible operations or qualities not otherwise available. Ultrasonic cleaning already is being employed for high precision parts. Ultrasonic welding of dissimilar metals or foils has been effective in cases in which no other method is possible. The plasma gun is able to weld high-temperature materials in temperature ranges beyond the reach of other methods. Explosive forming is a fast, cheap method of forming heavy rocket nozzle plates and doing other military work. Fairly rapid extension of rotary extrusion, currently used in missile component manufacture, is ahead.

The study comments on advances in the strength of materials. In airframe materials, changes seem to have moved at a fantastic rate. The working of such metals will require continuing development of old and introduction of new machining methods. At this point, it is not clear whether the new methods will displace or merely supplement established processes.

MATERIAL IMPROVEMENTS, TOO

Many of the new methods not only work the material but change its basic properties, many times resulting in a major improvement in the quality of the material. This factor, the study asserts, is evident in the missile development programs. Requirements include increased heat and wear resistance, higher yield points and lower fatigue levels. The materials available in the early stages of the programs and conventional ways of working them did not meet design requirements. Developments of new methods has taken time and is still in process—a major factor in greatly extended missile leadtime.

NEW PRODUCTS, NEW METHODS

Production technology should progress about the same as product development, the study is reported to conclude, otherwise serious production delays will occur. Every major advance in military equipment design is almost sure to need a concurrent advance in production technology. The study is said to warn that U.S. industrial prowess no longer is assured in a time when weapons technology is moving so rapidly.

The Army has 85,000 to 90,000 machine tools, the study is purported to reveal, of which around 75,000 are of the cutting type. These machines are regarded as the critical element in the Army's industrial production base to be drawn on to break manufacturing bottlenecks in an emergency. About 9 out of 10 of these machines were built either in World War II or in the Korean period; and almost 3 out of 5 are in storage. Possibly as many as one out of four are being operated at low rates in Government-owned, Government-operated facilities.

PRODUCTION PACKAGES

A sizable proportion of the inventory is stored in "producttion packages," on the theory that all the machines in a production package could be assembled and put into operation quickly. The Johns Hopkins study is reported to challenge this theory, because shifts in products and in material require different machines and machining processes. On one major weapon, around 70 percent of the parts were changed, with corresponding changes in tooling, jigs and the basic machines. A Ford Motor Co. study of a medium tank package arrived at the same conclusion—that the theory is invalid.

Rebuilding of overage machines is not a process that can modernize an old tool, the study is said to declare. Improvements can be made but the machine cannot be brought up to modern standards. Obsolescence begins on the day the machine originally leaves the factory and its basic characteristics remain substantially unchanged, regardless of reconditioning and rebuilding. Incidentally, only around one-sixteenth of the Army's machine tools is classified as new, compared with one-third in the Navy and Air Force.

MORE NEW RESERVE MACHINES?

The Army reserve does not contain any appreciable number of machine tools less than 5 years old. This fact is critical in considering any advantage that the reserve represents in leadtime. If a number of new long leadtime machines must be procured to supplement machines from the reserve in creating a production line in an emergency, any savings in leadtime disappear. In 1957, the study states, it was possible to meet from the Army's inventory less than one-fifth of the requests for reserve machine tools for missile production.

Defense contractors are not willing to accept from Army reserves old machines that do not meet the specifications of modern machines (despite the fact that private industry itself, in most cases, has an excessive number of overage machines of its own and is slow to spend its own money to replace them).

The condition of Army reserve tools, as coded, is an unreliable and misleading basis upon which to allocate or accept tools for a particular purpose. More than that, the study charges, the feasibility of machine test procedures is questionable. Tests are expensive (25 man-hours for a machine), test facilities are limited, and there is no assurance that after being tested, a machine will reach the contractor in good condition ready for use. Most deficiencies revealed by test could be detected by detailed inspection, but there is reason to believe that routine inspection is of little value in determining the condition of a machine.

A large percentage of the Army's machine tool inventory should be classed as poor, the study asserts. Processing of machines for storage has frequently not been in accordance with instructions and damage has resulted. Many reserve machines do not have the standard accessories going with a new machine. Instructions and records have been lost. The condition of much of the inventory is such that the machines will need some kind of rehabilitation or reconditioning before they can be used at all. Since the Korean conflict, there has been a continuing decline in the quality and composition of the inventory.

Advantages of modernization and replacement can be boiled down to an increase in capacity, in versatility and in quality of work performed. In two industries—automobiles and electrical machinery—the benefits of modernization can be put into terms of increases in capacity and decreases in numbers of machine tools. The increased capacity stemming from modernized production facilities is especially important in the military sector because of the urgency of developing a reserve against any future emergency needs.

A more versatile production base, particularly one with numerically controlled machines, would contribute substantially to reduce research and development leadtime the survey is reported to state. If design is to be liberated from the limitations imposed by outmoded equipment, modernization is absolutely essential.

The Army inventory of machine tools does not represent an adequate production base. Military equipment procurement costs are rising, partly because of increasing inefficiency of available production equipment and partly as a consequence of poor use of existing machines. The pressing budgetary problems of the services are such that economies in production costs must be made or fewer weapons can be produced. These economies, the Johns Hopkins study points out, can only be achieved by modernizing and replacing overage, obsolete, and wornout machines.

A production base modernization program should be tied to classes of products, not to specific products. It also should not be tied to a given year. It should be capable of dealing with varying requirements, such as the increasing sophistication of modern weapons, the modernization of Army combat equipment, and the supply needs of our allies.

Between 750 and 2,000 machine tools must be bought each year for the next few years if the Army is to maintain its production facilities even at a minimum level of efficiency, the study concludes. When the newer machines, such as numerically controlled units, start coming in after 1960, the Army's machine tool requirements may double or triple. If leadtime is to be kept as short as possible and production delays avoided, modernization should begin in the current fiscal year 1960 to meet 1965's new-weapons needs. Planned modernization will sharply reduce the number of machine tools required, will cut drastically the number of inactive tools, and will increase greatly the production capacity in place and in reserve.

TOO MANY OVERAGE TOOLS

The Johns Hopkins study cites the inventory of machine tools in the metalworking industry as preponderantly overage, averaging 13 to 15 years and constantly getting older. These conclusions are taken from the 1958 American Machinist Inventory of Metalworking Equipment. If the annual net

retirement rate of cutting-type machines is upward of 30,000 units and the annual purchase rate of new machines is 60,000 units between now and 1965, the percentage of overage tools will rise from its present level of 60 to 67 percent.

It thus is apparent that obsolescence and wear will rule out a large proportion of the U.S. machine tool inventory, both in the military and private industry sectors, as available to meet requirements of a modern military base. Contrariwise, only a fraction of the Nation's machine tools are capable of doing an efficient job in producing today's and tomorrow's advanced weapons. For this reason the problem of securing competent subcontractors for defense work is becoming increasingly critical. Whereas the Government and the armed services have shown proper concern about weapons, at the same time they have neglected the source from which these weapons must come—the machine tools of American industry. By contrast, Russia is awake to this situation and is putting major emphasis on modernization of its productive facilities.

Full modernization of U.S. metalworking facilities, the study is said to conclude, could be met by an annual outlay of much less than 2 percent of gross sales and would provide by 1965 the modern, versatile production base needed by advancing weapons technology. The savings in metalworking costs on military items alone would more than cover the capital outlay. If there is to be a sound national defense system, there is no alternative to modernization of the U.S. metalworking industry.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we are torn between two conflicting assertions: That we as a Nation cannot afford to arm ourselves adequately, and by the less vocal but nonetheless substantial segment who would suggest that we cannot afford to disarm.

All of us yearn for the day when we can turn off the defense expenditudes faucet, but when we suggest it there are those who realize that it will have an enormous impact on our economy. How are we to make this transition? How are we to establish a blueprint in America which will repudiate the Communist charge that America is the warmonger because America cannot afford to disarm? We have ripples in our economy when we even reduce our defense expenditures. What will happen, the Communists ask, when we turn off expenditures of $40 billion?

All of us know such enormous expenditures will not be shut off overnight, and that transitions will be made. Let us study now the methods whereby the transition should be brought about. Let us study now how the termination or modification or decrease in major defense undertakings can be accomplished without severe dislocation of the Nation's labor force and its economy. The city in Maryland which was the subject of today's debate on this point is only a symptom in this whole problem.

I hope consideration and support may be given to my resolution, which aims to provide guidelines which will enable us more confidently to return to reduced defense expenditures, which would affect a community in my own State, among others. I think Senate Resolution 150 would accomplish that purpose.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

MARY W. GREENE—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on June 24 H.R. 5350, a private bill for the relief of Mary W. Greene, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, following its passage by the House. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, has that matter been cleared?

Mr. HART. Yes, it has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 4, 1959, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 577. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, section 2481, to authorize the U.S. Coast Guard to sell certain utilities in the immediate vicinity of a Coast Guard activity not available from local sources;

S. 906. An act to amend section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to clarify the meaning of the term "change of program of education or training" as used in such section;

S. 1110. An act to amend the act of August 4, 1955 (Public Law 237, 84th Cong.), to provide for conveyance of certain interests in the lands covered by such act;

S. 1367. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft;

S. 1694. An act to extend the existing authority to provide hospital and medical care for veterans who are U.S. citizens temporarily residing abroad to include those with peacetime service-incurred disabilities;

S. 2153. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to accept, operate, and maintain a certain defense housing facility at Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes; and

S. 2183. An act granting the consent of Congress to interstate compacts for the development or operation of airport facilities.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 5, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 4, 1959:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Byron E. Blankinship, of Oregon.
A. David Fritzlan, of Kentucky.
Max McCullough, of Texas.

Weldon Litsey, of Texas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Stanislaus B. Milus, of New York.
Donald Kaye Palmer, of Michigan.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

William M. Kahmann, of Missouri.
Miss Margaret Ruth Kelley, of California.
David H. McCabe, of Maryland.
Miss Irene L. Rossi, of Pennsylvania.
Benjamin J. Ruyle, of Washington.
Charles T. Warner, of West Virginia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ramón S. Alfonzo, of New Jersey.
J. Anthony Armenta, of California.
John Coffey, of Illinois.
Randolph Dickins, Jr., of Virginia.
Stanley H. Schaub, of Maryland.
Anthony E. Sega, of New York.

Julius W. Walker, Jr., of Texas, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 7 to class 6.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Richard B. Andrews, of Illinois.
James O. Belden, of New York.
Eugene E. Champagne, Jr., of New York.
Harold A. Church, of Massachusetts.
Ellis V. Glynn, of Pennsylvania.
Benjamin C. Goode, of Ohio.
Miss Hazel E. Gordon, of Minnesota.
John W. Haigh, of New Hampshire.
Reppard D. Hicks, of Florida.
Stanley M. Howe, of Illinois.
Samuel Karp, of Pennsylvania.
Darold W. Keane, of California.
Frederick J. Lindow, of Florida.
Miss Olga Lukashewich, of New York.
Mrs. Kathryn Z. McCoy, of Indiana.
Miss Mary E. Mellette, of South Carolina.
Mrs. Marian D. Miller, of Massachusetts.
Arthur Parolini, of California.
Miss Ruth E. Wagner, of New York.
Miss Eleanor Frances Welch, of Ohio.
Raymond S. Yaukey, of Maryland.
Miss Betty Lou Zimmerman, of Texas.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

Herbert Eugene Horowitz, of New York.
Nelson C. Ledsky, of Ohio.
Robert von Pagenhardt, of California.
Howard L. Worthington, Jr., of Virginia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Joe L. Alarid, of Colorado.
Miss Elsie C. Bell, of California.
Frank L. Berry, of Kentucky.
Miss Anne L. Carroll, of Idaho.
Ernst Conrath, of Wisconsin.
Howard B. Crotinger, of Iowa.
Miss Margot J. Fellinger, of New Jersey.
Thaddeus J. Figura, of Illinois.
Coradino E. Gatti, of Massachusetts.
John O. Grimes, of Alabama.
Thomas J. Grimes, of Illinois.
Kenneth O. Harris, of West Virginia.
Miss Lorraine C. Herron, of Minnesota.
Frank P. Irwin, of Illinois.
Don C. Jensen, of California.
Mrs. Lucy N. Johansen, of Oregon.
James Kidder, of Ohio.
Thomas R. Kresse, of Ohio.
Robert C. LaPrade, of Massachusetts.
Miss Helen H. Larson, of Minnesota.
Joaquin Mariota, of California.
Miss Clare Ree Moore, of California.

Wilbur N. Nadel, of New Jersey.
Roy C. Nelson, of New York.
William M. Nikolin, of Indiana.
Joseph E. Olenik, of Pennsylvania.
Edward B. Pohl, of Louisiana.
Robert Prieto, of Wisconsin.
Miss Mary K. Richmond, of Oregon.
Valentine E. Scalise, of New York.
Miss Constance V. Stuck, of Arkansas.
Eugene S. Szopa, of Maine.
James Richard Vandivier, of Indiana.
Louis Villalovos, of California.
Frank E. Wallace, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Thomas D. Boyatt, of Ohio.
Thomas Stanley Brooks, of Wyoming.
Garrett C. Burke, of Iowa.
Francis B. Corry, of Wisconsin.
John James de Martino, of the District of Columbia.
Stamps Farrar, Jr., of Louisiana.
Norman H. Frisbie, of Massachusetts.
Robert E. Fritts, of Illinois.
Joseph M. Hardman, of Oregon.
Serge P. Horeff, of New Jersey.
Arthur V. Laemmerzahl, of New Jersey.
George A. McFarland, Jr., of Texas.
Richard R. Martin, of the District of Columbia.
Thomas R. Pickering, of Pennsylvania.
Peter Andrews Poole, of New York.
Pierre Shostal, of New York.
Michael B. Smith, of Massachusetts.
John W. Stahlman, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Sara Ann Stauffer, of Rhode Island.
William O. Sugg III, of Tennessee.
Donald P. Swisher, of California.
Richard W. Teare, of Ohio.
Olin S. Whittemore, of Michigan.
Michael G. Wygant, of Massachusetts.
Joseph R. Yodzis, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service Staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Richard T. Hamilton, of Virginia.
Abraham N. Hopman, of New York.
Walter H. Hummel, of North Dakota.
William Lipper, of Arizona.
Ralph S. Smith, of Maryland.
William H. Smith, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

David H. Cohn, of Florida.
Charles I. Cooper, of Massachusetts.
Harold I. Fiedler, of New Jersey.
Robert W. Hamerschlag, of New York.
Richard Linthicum, of Virginia.
Nestor D. Sanchez, of New Mexico.
Harry V. Scott, of Maryland.
Michael C. Sednaoui, of Colorado.
George W. Steitz, of Connecticut.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Robert C. Bodden, of Florida.
William C. Boner, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Paul R. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
John F. Murnane, of Virginia.
William J. Murray, Jr., of Washington.
Winston C. Oliver, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas B. Peck, Jr., of Virginia.
Jonathan D. Petry, of California.
Frank Rettenberg, of New York.
Samuel H. Rickard III, of Michigan.
Robert M. Schram, of Pennsylvania.
J. Bruce Scrymgeour, of New York.
Stephen J. Shuttack, of Wisconsin.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William Anderson, Jr., of Virginia.
Vincent J. Augliere, of Virginia.
Roger M. Bearce, of Maine.
William L. Clark, of the District of Columbia.
Benjamin C. Evans, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Paul V. Harwood, of Pennsylvania.
Frank W. Jones, Jr., of Connecticut.
Thomas H. Karamessines, of Virginia.
William F. Miller, of Massachusetts.
Jean M. Nater, of Connecticut.
Donald M. Richardson, of Virginia.
Robert L. Skidmore, of the District of Columbia.
James R. West, of California.
Robert P. Wheeler, of the District of Columbia.
Oscar Zaglits, of the District of Columbia.

BOARD OF PAROLE

Lewis J. Grout, of Kansas, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1965. Mr. Grout is now serving in this post under an appointment which expires September 30, 1959.

Gerald E. Murch, of Maine, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1965. Mr. Murch is now serving in this post under an appointment which expires September 30, 1959.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 4, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lamentations 3: 25: *The Lord is good unto them that wait for Him, to the soul that seeketh Him.*

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, daily many deep, heartfelt needs and haunting longings impel us to wait upon Thee and seek Thy face in prayer.

We earnestly beseech Thee to lift us above all anxieties and fears into a faith that fulfills itself in a greater courage and joy.

Grant that, dedicated to the ministry of the true and the good, we may give help and hope to all who are finding the struggle of life so difficult.

May we be loyal partners with men and nations everywhere who are laboring to build a world wherein righteousness reigns and the law of love is gloriously triumphant.

Hear us in the name of the lowly man of Galilee who went about doing good. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3322. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, and certain other laws to authorize the payment of transportation and travel allowances to escorts of dependents of members of the uniformed services under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7508. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a Bureau of Naval Weapons in the Department of the Navy and to abolish the Bureaus of Aeronautics and Ordnance.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7978. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. DWORSHAK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8283. An act making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 6596) entitled "An act to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1590. An act for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland; and

S. 1849. An act to amend the act of August 10, 1939, authorizing the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8283) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs.

CANNON, RABAUT, KIRWAN, JENSEN, and TABER.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight August 5 to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 8283) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE LATE MRS. MARY T. NORTON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the tragic passing of the late Mary T. Norton who previously served the 13th Congressional District of New Jersey, a district that I now have the pleasure to serve. I am very proud to represent the 13th District of New Jersey, which has always been referred to as Mary Norton's old district.

Today we mourn the death of this extraordinary woman. For upon her death, not only her family and her city pays her honor, but she is mourned by her Nation which she served so well.

In an era when women had just received their right to vote, Mrs. Norton served notice that not only do women enjoy the right to vote but had a right and a duty to participate on an equal basis in the Government of the United States.

She was the first woman to be elected by the Democratic Party to Congress. She headed the important District of Columbia Committee and for years served most ably in this capacity. She was chairman of the House Labor Committee which made the minimum wage-hour law part of the American scene.

She was a champion of many just causes which we now accept as part of the American way of life.

She was a woman who made a great contribution to this Congress and in so doing, made a great contribution to her country.

We mourn her passing today, but remember well her personality, her character, and her good works.

She shall always be remembered as one of the foremost women in American public life.

She served this body for 26 years. On her retirement, President Truman appointed her as a consultant in the Department of Labor.

This Nation that she served so well, I am sure, joins in a silent moment of prayer for Mrs. Mary Norton—affectionately known to all as "Aunt Mary."

She will be missed and she shall long be remembered, with the grateful thanks of the Nation she served.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point on the life and accomplishments of this very honorable woman whose death we mourn here today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. McCormack and I are deeply grieved in the death of our late friend, Mary Norton.

Mrs. Norton, our late former colleague, served in this body during a most trying period of our country, with great ability, vision, and courage. While a Member of this body she served as chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, and also as chairman of the Committee on Labor.

She was a close and valued friend of the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt and of former President Harry S. Truman.

Mary Norton, as a Member of the House, and particularly as chairman of the Committee on Labor, led many fights for the passage of progressive legislation recommended by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Under her able and courageous leadership many progressive measures in the best interest of our country and our people were enacted into law.

On many occasions—fighting for the people—Mary Norton showed her fighting heart. In fighting for the people she asked no quarter and gave no quarter to opponents of progressive leadership.

Mary Norton served in Congress for years. I can remember the dramatic fights she made for minimum wage legislation and other progressive measures.

I remember well when the Taft-Hartley bill was under consideration in the House her fighting statement, "The labor baiters and the labor haters at long last are having a field day."

She has indelibly left her favorable imprint upon the pages of American history.

The many thousands of her friends will always remember this fine lady, this great legislator, this outstanding American, Mary T. Norton.

To her two sisters who survive her and their loved ones I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] and our distinguished majority leader in lamenting the passing of one of New Jersey's greatest citizens. Not only was Mary Norton a fine liberal and a conscientious Member of this body, but she was one of the most highly respected women on the national scene. She was, among other things, for many years vice chairman of the New Jersey Democratic State Committee. She maintained her interest in the affairs of the House of Representatives and of the Nation until a very few days before her death.

She was in constant communication with me and with my staff, some of whom had served under her, and all of whom regret her passing.

The State of New Jersey and the Nation have indeed lost a great woman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved yesterday to see in the paper a picture of, and a notice of the passing of, the late Mary Norton, Member of Congress from New Jersey, one of the handsomest, finest women I have ever been privileged to know. She was elected to Congress a few months before I was, and I found inspiration from her in our close congressional service. She was a fine and true friend.

Before coming to Congress, Mary Norton had a fine record of accomplishments, and as a Member of Congress she became a highly respected politician and national figure. She added luster to her name. She was thoroughly loyal. I do believe the cause of women never had a finer friend than she. She believed in their having their place in the sun. Mary Norton was warmhearted and strong, loyal to her family, loyal to party, loyal to her country.

Although she was a Democrat, when she went to Boston she often spoke of me. There was no party line in her friendships. We who served with her here—and there are not many left here now—know of her tremendous fight for every cause she thought was right. She wanted to help the underprivileged. Her battle for improved labor conditions will receive the gratitude of children yet unborn. It was not a political gesture in any way. She was a great patriot, always fighting for national defense. She always pushed onward and upward. She was a very religious woman, a power in her church, a power in the country.

We cannot spare women like Mary Norton. In my opinion, we cannot replace her.

My deepest sympathy goes to her sisters and brother and their children, and to the family she loved and helped so much, and to her countless friends.

The following is an article that appeared in the New York Times on Monday, August 3, 1959:

MARY T. NORTON, 84, LEGISLATOR, DEAD—JERSEY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, 1925–50, HEADED LABOR COMMITTEE 10 YEARS

GREENWICH, CONN., August 2.—Former Representative Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey, died of a heart attack today in Greenwich Hospital. She was 84 years old.

Mrs. Norton was stricken yesterday at her home here at 52 Lafayette Place. She had moved here 3 years ago from her former home at 2400 Hudson Boulevard in Jersey City.

Surviving are two sisters, Mrs. Joseph McDonagh, of Greenwich, and Miss Anne Hopkins, of New York.

DEAN OF WOMEN IN CONGRESS

Mrs. Norton held the record for length of service by a woman Representative when she announced on her 75th birthday in March 1950 that she would not seek reelection to Congress. She served for 25 years in the House.

She was induced to enter politics by Mayor Frank Hague, of Jersey City, in 1920. Her district, the 13th of New Jersey, formerly the 12th, comprises Bayonne and part of Jersey City.

Mrs. Norton was the first woman elected to Congress by the Democratic Party. She was chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia for 5 years, being the first woman to head a congressional committee. She also was named to the House

Labor Committee and in 1937 became its chairman. She held the chairmanship until 1947, and then became a member of the House Administration Committee.

Her interest in labor affairs never waned, however, and when the Taft-Hartley bill was being discussed in Congress, she said:

"The labor baiters and the labor haters at long last are having a field day."

In 1945 she had met opposition from labor groups when she introduced a House bill seeking to implement President Harry S. Truman's request to Congress for authorization to set up fact-finding boards in industrial disputes.

FETED BY COLLEAGUES

In both 1945 and 1950 fellow Members in the House feted Mrs. Norton. On her 25th anniversary in Congress and her 75th birthday, Mrs. Norton, in a hospital with pneumonia and influenza, issued her announcement of retirement.

Mrs. Norton was a stanch New Dealer and helped to guide the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt's wage and hour legislation as well as to defend it later. She also championed the Fair Employment Practices Act and was instrumental in raising the minimum-wage level from 40 to 75 cents an hour.

Mrs. Norton served as State Democratic Committee vice chairman from 1921 to 1932, and as chairman in 1932 to 1935 and again from 1940 to 1944.

In 1923 she became the first woman elected a freeholder in Hudson County and the State. Mrs. Norton was named delegate-at-large to the Democratic National Conventions from 1924 through 1940 and in 1944 was a delegate serving on the platform-drafting committee. In 1944 she became a member of the Democratic National Committee. Four years later she was the convention chairman of credentials.

ALWAYS BACKED HAGUE MACHINE

She maintained her support of the Hague machine throughout her career and at the time she announced her retirement was instrumental in retaining Mr. Hague on the New Jersey State Executive Committee by outmaneuvering his enemies.

During her early years in Congress, Mrs. Norton introduced the first resolution to repeal the 18th amendment and spoke widely for repeal of prohibition. She also opposed the Gillette bill, fostering dissemination of birth-control information.

She was born in Jersey City on March 7, 1875, the daughter of Thomas and Marie Shea Hopkins. After attending public schools and a business college and working as a stenographer and secretary she was married in 1909 to Robert Francis Norton, a businessman. He died in 1934.

After the death of her infant son, Robert Francis, Mrs. Norton became active in day nurseries and was president of the Day Nursery Association of Jersey City. She received an honorary doctor of laws degree from St. Elizabeth's College in 1930 for constructive humanitarian work in welfare and politics. In 1937 she received a similar degree from Rider College.

In May 1947, she was named the outstanding Catholic woman of the year and received the Siena medal of Theta Phi Alpha, National Society of Catholic Women, at ceremonies in Norwood, Mass.

Mrs. Norton was a member of the National Business and Professional Women's League, the Queens Daughters and the Catholic Daughters of America.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the few left in the House who had the great privilege of serving with Mary Norton. As my colleague, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] has said, she was so deeply loyal in all phases of her life to her family, her friends, her party, and her country. A woman of great dignity, she had a delightful sense of humor, without which she could not have sustained the vicissitudes a none too easy life gave her. Courage was hers as well, and great endurance. We had many good times together, thoroughly enjoying our almost complete divergence of opinion. She was a fighter and a politician of the first water. She knew politics from the ground up as I shall never know it, and she was generous with her knowledge whenever I asked her for a judgment, an opinion. Yes, we had good times together, sharing some of our joys and some of our sorrows, getting to appreciate some of the basic values of our common experience here.

I join with all those of this House in sympathy to her bereaved family to whom she gave so much of herself and who did so much for her. Yet would I say to them that I feel sure they join with me in gratitude for her, for all she did in her determined effort to do all possible to leave this world a little better than she found it. May Heaven bless and keep her as her soul takes a broader road upon which she can continue to serve Him, who is the Infinite Father of all mankind.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey in this word of tribute to my beloved friend, Mary Norton. Mrs. Norton was not only a great Congresswoman, she was one of the most distinguished Representatives ever to serve in this body. She served as chairman of two great committees in this House. She was a wonderful person, a great soul. Mrs. Albert and I, who met her when we first came to Washington, join in extending our deepest sympathy to her loved ones.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, although a member of the opposition, it was one of the many privileges that have been mine to serve under Mrs. Norton when she was chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. She was not only able, she was courageous, aggressive, and constructive.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I learned with the deepest regret of the death of Mrs. Norton. I think no Member has served in the House of Representatives more effectively than the distinguished Congresswoman, Mrs. Norton.

She was the first woman to serve as chairman of a committee in the American Congress.

She exerted a far-reaching influence not only in the House of Representatives but especially as a member of the Democratic National Committee on which she served for many years.

She brought to her service in the House of Representatives and to her service for the Nation not only exceptional ability but a woman's intuition through which all welfare legislation especially was vitally affected.

She was a leader in the early days of many of our governmental activities now taken for granted, which were at that time in the pioneering stage.

She builded better than she knew.

I join my colleagues in expressing to those nearest her my deepest sympathy.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I could not permit this occasion to pass without expressing the feelings of us in Minnesota. I watched the career of Mrs. Norton very carefully. During the height of her legislative activity it was my pleasure to be a member of the Minnesota State Legislature and her career indeed was an inspiration to me. At the same time I was serving as a member of our legislature I was active in the labor movement, and just prior to my coming to the House of Representatives Mrs. Norton had left this body. Her retirement from Congress was a great loss to this body, and her passing today is indeed a sad day for the millions of little people in the United States, to help whom she did her utmost, trying to make their tomorrow a better day.

So I join, Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the millions of people who admired her so greatly. This is indeed a sad day.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Norton had already retired from this House before I became a Member of this body, but the legend of her service had already been established. Many Members came to me and told me of the wonderful work she had done. As a woman I am grateful that she lighted the way for the rest of us to follow. She did an exceedingly good job.

I, too, extend my deep regrets and my sympathy to those of her family who remain.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the Members for their kind and affectionate words.

I now yield to our beloved Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to the memory of Mary T. Norton by inserting in the RECORD a telegram I sent to her sisters:

Mrs. JOSEPH MCDONAGH and Miss ANN HOPKINS,
Greenwich, Conn.:

You have my deepest and sincerest sympathy in the loss of your dear sister and my good friend. She was a wonderful person and served her country nobly and with great devotion. I shall miss her along with her other loved ones.

SAM RAYBURN.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I learned of the death of my former colleague, the Honorable Mary T. Norton. I extend to her family

my deepest sympathy and want them to know that I, too, will miss her.

It was a wonderful experience to have known Mary Norton, to have served with her in Congress, and it was an honor to have been included among her vast number of friends. I will always cherish her memory and always remember the dignity portrayed by her as a woman and a public servant.

One learned much from observing and knowing Mary Norton. She loved people. She tried to understand people and, much more, she respected all people. She loved life and maintained a keen interest in all events. She never lost her sense of humor. For these characteristics and for the record she established in the House, I am sure that history will record her as one of the "great" Representatives of the House of Representatives. She served the people of her district, the people of her State and this Nation, always bearing in mind the absolute principles upon which this Nation was established. It was upon these moral principles that her own life was based and, more important, that she lived.

For her, I am sure there is joy today because she lived serving God and neighbor, thus abiding by the two great commandments of God which will determine all our destinies. May her soul rest in peace.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in this House and the many citizens of our country in expressing deep sorrow in the death of a great American, the Honorable Mary T. Norton, a former Member of this House.

Mrs. Norton represented the people of the 13th District of New Jersey with great honor and distinction. She established an outstanding record of which any Member of the House would be proud.

In her career as a Member of the House of Representatives she established a long record of firsts.

She was the first woman Democrat to be elected to Congress.

She was the first woman chairman of a committee of the House of Representatives—the Committee of the District of Columbia, and as chairman served as the District's first and only "Lady Mayor."

She was the first woman to head the Labor Committee and played an important part in the passage of new labor legislation, including the wage and hour bill.

She was a person of courage and determination devoted to her duties and responsibilities, and her action as a legislator served as an inspiration to all of her colleagues. She was indeed a dedicated public servant.

To the members of her family I extend my sincere sympathy and heartfelt sorrow at her passing.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with keen sorrow I learned yesterday of the death of Mary Norton, who served with great distinction for many years as a Member of the House of Representatives. Mrs. Norton came to Congress the the same year that I did and consequently we established a true bond of friendship through the years.

She had the distinction of being the first woman to be elected to Congress as a Democrat. She was a woman of great ability and left a lasting impression upon the legislative program during her long service. She was a great humanitarian and worked tirelessly to advance the welfare of the needy, the deserving, and the oppressed. Her sisters may well be proud of her service to our country and to them I extend my heartfelt sympathy in their hour of sorrow.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman Norton left the House only 2 years before I was elected, and I have always regretted that I did not have the privilege of serving with her. She was the first woman elected to Congress by the Democratic Party, and her influence and sound judgment paved the way for more women to follow.

Mrs. Norton had other firsts, too. She was the first woman elected a freeholder in her native Hudson County, N.J.; first woman to head a congressional committee, and she was the author of the first congressional resolution to repeal the 18th amendment. She championed the Fair Employment Practices Act and was instrumental in raising the minimum wage level from 40 to 75 cents an hour.

Mrs. Norton's liberal and humanitarian record throughout her 25 years in the Legislative Halls in the Nation's Capitol has been a source of inspiration and emulation to those of us who followed her. Her courage and strength have been like beacons lighting the way for us.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the death of the Honorable Mary Teresa Norton this Nation has lost one of its outstanding citizens—and I have personally lost a warm and valued friend.

Mrs. Norton was in every sense a grand and wonderful woman—one who extended wholehearted encouragement to me last fall when I began my campaign for Congress against what seemed insurmountable odds.

I shall always remember the warmth of her words at that time and will always be appreciative of her suggestions and guidance.

Mrs. Norton held the record for length of service by a woman Member of the House of Representatives when she announced on her 75th birthday in March 1950, that she would not seek reelection to Congress. She served 25 years in the House.

She did not represent my congressional district, but has spent her late years in Connecticut where, until the very end, she retained a keen interest in the affairs of the world, and of the Democratic Party.

Mrs. Norton was the first woman elected to Congress by the Democratic Party. She was chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia for 5 years, being the first woman to head a congressional committee. She also was named to the House Labor Committee and in 1937 became its chairman. She held the chairmanship until 1947, and then became a member of the House Administration Committee.

Her interest in labor affairs never waned, however, and when the Taft-Hartley bill was being discussed in Congress, she said:

> The labor baiters and the labor haters at long last are having a field day.

In 1945 she had met opposition from labor groups when she introduced a House bill seeking to implement President Harry S Truman's request to Congress for authorization to set up fact-finding boards in industrial disputes.

In both 1945 and 1950 fellow members in the House feted Mrs. Norton. On her 25th anniversary in Congress and her 75th birthday, Mrs. Norton, in a hospital with pneumonia and influenza, issued her announcement of retirement.

Mrs. Norton was a stanch New Dealer and helped to guide the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt's wage and hour legislation as well as to defend it later. She also championed the Fair Employment Practices Act and was instrumental in raising the minimum-wage level from 40 to 75 cents an hour.

Mrs. Norton served as State Democratic Committee vice chairman from 1921 to 1932, and as chairman in 1932 to 1935, and again from 1940 to 1944.

In 1923 she became the first woman elected a freeholder in Hudson County and the State. Mrs. Norton was named delegate-at-large to the Democratic National Conventions from 1924 through 1940 and in 1944 was a delegate serving on the platform-drafting committee. In 1944 she became a member of the Democratic National Committee. Four years later she was the convention chairman of credentials.

During her early years in Congress Mrs. Norton introduced the first resolution to repeal the 18th amendment and spoke widely for repeal of prohibition. She also opposed the Gillette bill, fostering dissemination of birth-control information.

She was born in Jersey City on March 7, 1875, the daughter of Thomas and Marie Shea Hopkins. After attending public schools, a business college, and working as a stenographer and secretary she was married in 1909 to Robert Francis Norton, a business man. He died in 1934.

After the death of her infant son, Robert Francis, Mrs. Norton became active in day nurseries and was president of the Day Nursery Association of Jersey City. She received an honorary doctor of laws degree from St. Elizabeth's College in 1930 for "constructive humanitarian work in welfare and politics." In 1937 she received a similar degree from Rider College.

In May 1947, she was named the "outstanding Catholic Woman of the Year" and received the Siena Medal of Theta Phi Alpha, National Society of Catholic Women, at ceremonies in Norwood, Mass.

Mr. Norton was a member of the National Business and Professional Women's League, the Queens Daughters, and the Catholic Daughters of America.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved and shocked to learn of the passing last Sunday, August 2, of our distinguished former colleague from New Jersey, Mrs. Mary T. Norton. This loss will be felt deeply by all of us who knew her and worked with her during

her long years of service in the House. For the people of Washington, Glenn Dale Sanitarium stands as a fitting memorial commemorating her 7 years' work as chairman of the House District Committee. For Mrs. McCormack and me, the loss is that of a close personal friend. I shall always hold Mrs. Norton in high esteem as a conscientious hard-working colleague, as we defended the wages and hours bill against opposition in May of 1940, and when she served as cochairman with me of platform and resolutions at the 1944 Democratic National Convention.

Mary T. Norton would like to be remembered, I am sure, primarily as a wife and mother, as a devoted family woman. Born in Jersey City 84 years ago, she attended the public schools and had just graduated from high school when her mother died. Her family came first and she deferred any plans of her own for 5 years while she cared for her father and managed the home. Then she felt free to take a secretarial course at Packard Business College and worked as a stenographer until her marriage to Robert Francis Norton in 1909.

The great personal tragedy of her life, the death of her only child in infancy, started her on a long and distinguished career in legislative service. To overcome her despondency and grief, she began to work for the Queen's Daughters Day Nursery. Her qualities of leadership were soon recognized by local and State officials and in 1916 she became president of the Day Nurseries Association of Jersey City. From this office to higher State and national positions were only short steps for Mary Norton as she blazed the trail with a long line of firsts. In 1923 she became the first woman elected freeholder in Hudson County and the State of New Jersey. In 1925 she was sent to the 69th Congress representing the 12th New Jersey District, becoming the first Democratic woman to be elected to Congress, and the first woman Representative of any eastern State. She became the first woman to head any House committee when she served from 1930–37 as chairman of the House District Committee, earning the affectionate title of "Lady Mayor of Washington."

Some Members of the House will remember the gala occasion in 1945 when we helped Mary Norton celebrate her 70th birthday and 20th anniversary in Congress. Similar festivities 5 years later on her silver anniversary in Congress and her 75th birthday, were somewhat saddened when she announced from a hospital bed her plans for retirement in 1951. We were pleased, however, that she elected to remain in Washington as a special consultant on manpower to the Labor Department until 1953.

Wife, mother, businesswoman, legislator—her career was varied, her life was rich and full, her heart was big and kind. When she could no longer be a mother to her own son after his death, she turned, through welfare work, to being a mother for other people's children. Her horizons broadened and soon she was working for the entire Nation. Genial and unassuming, we shall all feel the loss of her wonderful presence. Our sympathy goes out to her two surviving sisters, Mrs. Joseph B. McDonagh and Miss Anne Hopkins.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who had the pleasure of knowing "Aunt Mary" during her term of service here in the House of Representatives, I feel a keen sorrow over the news of her death.

I remember vividly this gracious woman, the late gentle lady from New Jersey, Mrs. Mary T. Norton. Generous of nature and character this unassuming and unpretentious, fine lady who held such a high place for many years here in the House and performed in such a distinguished manner, came to be looked upon by many of us as "Aunt Mary."

Still vivid in my mind is the memory of her help to me as a freshman Member of the House and her sincere and honest counsel and advice. For this I am and shall ever be grateful to our beloved "Aunt Mary."

Mrs. Norton was a champion of human rights and an ardent advocate of the cause of human welfare. Her service in the Congress was studded with brilliant accomplishment and worthwhile achievement. And despite the awesome responsibilities she never failed to give of herself unselfishly to many charitable endeavors, winning many awards and honors for her work in this area.

Although she retired from the Congress in early 1951, "Aunt Mary" never retired from the cause of helping others. I kept in touch with her over the years during her retirement, and from time to time learned of her continued good works.

It is sad to know that "Aunt Mary" has left the scene, but she has earned a lasting place in the lives and hearts of many whom she has helped and in the history of our country as a great humanitarian and a great public servant. She was truly a dedicated person who served her fellowman and country with a full measure of devotion.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow and a sense of deep personal loss that I learned of the death of the Honorable Mary T. Norton. Like all who had the privilege of knowing her, I had the greatest respect and admiration for this wise and gracious lady who made such a tremendous contribution to our national welfare during her long public service.

Mrs. Norton combined great ability and breadth of vision with a strong and courageous will. As a Member of the House, especially as chairman of important committees, she was instrumental in the enactment of numerous important measures that have been of lasting benefit to the whole country. Mrs. Norton's name will always be associated with progressive, humanitarian programs. She had deep compassion for the poor and weak, and was a stanch advocate of social welfare measures.

Mrs. Norton had many memorable firsts in her distinguished career. She was the first Democratic Congresswoman, the first woman to head a congressional committee, and the first woman chairman of a major House committee. Her accomplishments were great, and she has earned a unique place in American history.

The American people have much reason to be grateful to this dedicated public servant. She was a great lady, and her passing is keenly felt by all who knew her. I join my colleagues in expressing to her dear ones my deepest sympathy.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the death this week of Mary T. Norton is a special loss to the people of New Jersey, to the women of America, and to me personally.

Mrs. Norton was not only the first woman in the Democratic Party to be elected to Congress; she was also the first woman to serve in that capacity from New Jersey. The people of the 13th District have great reason to be proud of that service.

Throughout her career, Mary Norton was a pacemaker and a precedent breaker. Her service in the House confirmed that women, indeed, have an important responsibility in the political life of our country. As the first woman chairman of a committee of the House of Representatives, in fact as chairman of both the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Labor, she exercised wise and courageous leadership, and devoted her talents to social and humanitarian legislation that even today are important influences in the welfare of working people throughout the country.

While our paths seldom crossed, it was my pleasure on a few occasions to meet and talk with Mrs. Norton. And I have always cherished the fact that the very first telegram of congratulations I received on the occasion of my first election to Congress came from that wonderful woman.

But all of New Jersey knew and loved Mary Norton for her courage and determination no less than for her friendliness, gentleness, and broad humanity. Her success, the distinction she earned in the political life of her Nation, helped pave the way for those of us who came after her. Women of New Jersey and the country who believe that women have a role to play in American Government owe a great deal to the pioneering of Mary T. Norton.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as a tribute as to the high esteem in which the late Mrs. Mary T. Norton was held by everyone, it is best expressed in the editorial which appeared in the Jersey Journal of August 3.

I would like to make this editorial part of the record of feeling that everyone held for Mrs. Mary T. Norton.

[From the Jersey Journal, Aug. 3, 1959]

MARY NORTON

Everywhere in the Nation today, people are recalling that it was Mary Norton who first really carved out a meaningful place for women in the Halls of Congress. Jersey City and Bayonne sent her to the House of Representatives not as a woman, nor merely as the widow of a Congressman, but as a capable legislator who could hammer out the Nation's laws as well as any man, if not better.

Historically, she was just what the Nation needed when many Americans were still wary of the effects of the suffrage newly extended to women and their participation in public life. Mrs. Norton was aware of her role as a trailblazer, and she met every challenge.

In 1925, when it was generally held that women Representatives had better be seen and not heard, Mrs. Norton was outspoken, right from her freshman year. She later headed important House committees. As head of the District of Columbia Committee, she was virtually mayor of the Nation's Capital. She was the first to introduce a bill to repeal the prohibition law. She was chairman of the House Labor Committee which made a minimum wage-hour law part of the American laboring standard.

That Mary Norton's extraordinary congressional career should have originated in Jersey City is something for her hometown to boast about, even in this hour of mourning.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish at this time to pay tribute to Mrs. Mary T. Norton, who for more than a quarter of a century represented the 12th New Jersey District in the House of Representatives. She died August 2 in a Greenwich, Conn., hospital following a heart attack at the age of 84.

I knew Mary Norton for many years. She began her service in Congress a year after I came to Washington as secretary to the late George N. Seger. I served with her in the House from 1940 until her retirement in 1951. She was a truly dedicated public servant held in high esteem by all of her colleagues.

At this time I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial tribute to Mrs. Norton from the Paterson Evening News, Paterson, N.J., of August 4, 1959:

AN ABLE WOMAN PASSES

Mary T. Norton, a great lady of New Jersey and national public life, has passed on to her eternal rest after a long and fruitful life.

Mrs. Norton, of Jersey City, amassed an impressive list of firsts in public life.

She was the first Congresswoman elected by the Democratic Party. Her tenure of 26 years—she retired voluntarily at age 75—is a record for congressional women. She was the first woman to head a congressional committee.

In addition, she was the first woman ever elected to the Hudson County Board of Freeholders, that service preceding congressional membership.

A stanch New Dealer, she supported her political preceptor, the late Mayor Frank Hague throughout her career, serving as Democratic National Committeewoman among important political posts.

An able lady with charm and grace, Mrs. Norton mixed practicalities of politics with an intuitive skill and in her trailblazing career for New Jersey womanhood, set the pattern for many others who have followed her.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a richly deserved editorial on our late friend and former colleague, Hon. Mary T. Norton, appearing in the Washington Star of August 7, 1959:

MARY T. NORTON

Mrs. Mary T. Norton, dead at 84, will be long remembered in Washington for her good works in behalf of a better National Capital. Although the interests of the former New Jersey Representative were varied, she devoted much of her long career in Congress to matters related to public welfare—always giving them the human interest touch. As first woman head of a House committee, she used her chairmanship of the District Committee to demand elimination of the city's slums, to seek suffrage for the District's "second-class citizens," to obtain the Glenn Dale Hospital for tuberculosis victims and otherwise to improve the lot of those who live here. A skilled politician and legislator, she fought hard and often successfully for the things in which she believed. Washington has lost a good friend with her passing.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, those of us who had been privileged to serve in this body with Mrs. Mary T. Norton were deeply saddened to learn of her death on August 2. Together with the hosts of her friends and admirers in many walks of life, we are conscious of a great loss and are reminded of her outstanding character and accomplishments. Of Mrs. Norton's many virtues, I believe that devotion was the keynote of her admirable character and the mainspring from which her great accomplishments stemmed.

In her public life devotion to God and to her country activated all her endeavors, as devotion to her family directed her private life.

As the first Democratic lady ever elected to the House of Representatives, Mrs. Norton was destined to a brilliant career lasting more than a quarter of a century, during which she did many important things for which she will long be remembered. The decision to terminate her service in the House was made, not by her constituents, but voluntarily by herself on the occasion of her 75th birthday.

Even before coming to the Congress, Mrs. Norton displayed in local affairs those facets of her character that brought so much success to her efforts here. Her achievements in behalf of the children of New Jersey brought recognition when she was selected as president of the Day Nurseries Association of Jersey City in 1916.

It was as a Member of this House, however, that Mrs. Norton's abilities were given full scope, and here she achieved her greatest public successes. Because of her devotion to her duty as a Representative of all the people and to their causes, she was not deterred by any current unpopularity of those causes. For example, early in her great legislative career she courageously introduced a resolution to repeal the 18th amendment when such a move did not enjoy the tremendous public support it later gained. The ultimate success of repeal owed a good deal to Mary Norton.

One of her greatest achievements in behalf of the workingman was the enactment of the Federal Wage and Hour Act. Many legislators and workers today who share the universal recognition of the value of that legislation either have forgotten or never knew the controversy that attended its enactment.

Twice during her service in the House her colleagues honored her—on the occasion of her completion of 20 years' service in 1945 and again on her silver anniversary as a Member in 1950. Perhaps the one honor that she cherished above all others was her well-merited selection as the Outstanding Catholic Woman of the Year in 1947.

Her colleagues remaining in the House will miss her as will her sisters and her innumerable friends. Our heartfelt sympathy is extended particularly to her sisters, Mrs. Joseph B. McDonagh, of Greenwich, Conn., and Miss Anne Hopkins, of New York.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late Mary T. Norton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Friday, August 7, to file a report on the military construction appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 743)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7454) "making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 5, 6, 12, 23, 33, 35, and 36.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 15, 18, 20, 28, 31, 32, and 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: ": *Provided*, That $32,700,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses necessary to maintain the Regular Marine Corps at the strength provided for in this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: ": *Provided*, That $29,700,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation

shall be available only to meet the increased expenses necessary to maintain the Army Reserve at the strength provided for in this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,075,390,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: ": *Provided*, That $24,300,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses necessary to maintain the Army National Guard at the strength provided for in this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: ": *Provided further*, That $24,500,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses necessary to maintain the Army Reserve at the strength provided for in this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,611,220,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: ": *Provided*, That $5,900,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses necessary to maintain the Regular Marine Corps at the strength provided for in this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: ": *Provided*, That $4,500,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses necessary to maintain the Regular Marine Corps at the strength provided for in this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,195,006,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: ": *Provided further*, That $5,700,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses necessary to maintain the Army National Guard at the strength provided for in this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,407,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,961,644,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,330,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26; That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$567,719,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,284,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,540,550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,109,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$2,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 631. Of the funds made available by this Act for the services of the Military Air Transport Service, $85,000,000 shall be available only for procurement of commercial air transportation service; and the Secretary of Defense shall utilize the services of civil air carriers which qualify as small businesses to the fullest extent found practicable."; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8, 21, 34, 38 and 40.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GERALD R. FORD, JR., (except as to amendments Nos. 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, and 19),
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
LISTER HILL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
HARRY F. BYRD,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES (except as to amendment No. 27),
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Title I—Military personnel

Amendment No. 1—Military personnel, Army: Language proposed by the Senate, relating to liquidation of deficiencies, is deleted. Similar provisions in Amendments Numbered 6 and 12 are also deleted.

The several provisions involved deal with deficiencies incurred in Military Personnel, Army, fiscal years 1956 and 1957, Military Personnel, Air Force, fiscal years 1958 and 1959, and Operation and Maintenance, Army, fiscal year 1958, for Medical Care. Previous requests to provide for certain of these deficiencies were also denied in connection with the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959, and the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1959. The deficiencies in question were incurred in clear and undeniable violation of the Antideficiency Law.

The provisions dealing with these deficiencies have been eliminated for the specific purpose of forcing the establishment of fund control systems which will preclude the further recurrence of such deficiencies. It is expected that the joint study of this problem by the General Accounting Office, the Department of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget will be completed and a full report presented to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate by the end of January 1960. Subsequent to such report, giving adequate assurance that future deficiencies of this nature will be avoided, estimates for the necessary appropriations should again be presented.

Amendment No. 2—Military personnel, Marine Corps: Appropriates $620,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $596,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3—Military personnel, Marine Corps: Permits transfer of $24,000,000 from the Marine Corps Stock Fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4—Military personnel, Marine Corps: Deletes language proposed by the Senate and inserts in lieu thereof the following language: ": *Provided*, That $32,700,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses necessary to maintain the Regular Marine Corps at the strength provided for in this Act." It is the intent of the Committee of Conference that the Regular Marine Corps achieve an end strength for fiscal year 1960 of 200,000 and that the $32,700,000 of additional funds provided by this appropriation item shall not be available for any other purpose.

Amendment No. 5—Military personnel, Air Force: Appropriates $3,912,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,892,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Military personnel, Air Force: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—Reserve personnel, Army: Deletes language proposed by the Senate and inserts in lieu thereof the following language: "*Provided*, That $29,700,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses necessary to maintain the Army Reserve at the strength provided for in this Act." It is the intent of the committee of conference that the Army Reserve

shall be maintained at an average strength of 300,000 during fiscal year 1960, and that the $29,700,000 of additional funds provided by this appropriation item shall not be available for any other purpose. In deleting the strength floor proposed by the Senate, the committee of conference is relying on the assurance of the Executive Branch that the strength of the Army Reserve will be maintained at an average strength of 300,000 during the fiscal year 1960.

Amendment No. 8—National Guard personnel, Army: Reported in disagreement.

Title II—Operation and maintenance

Amendment No. 9—Operation and maintenance, Army: Appropriates $3,075,390,000 instead of $3,065,390,000 as proposed by the House and $3,085,390,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10—Operation and maintenance, Army: Inserts language providing that $24,300,000 be available only to meet increased expenses of maintaining Army National Guard strength, similar to language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Operation and maintenance, Army: Inserts language providing that $24,500,000 be available only to meet increased expenses of maintaining Army Reserve strength, similar to language proposed by the Senate. See amendment number 7.

Amendment No. 12—Operation and maintenance, Army: Deletes language proposed by the Senate relating to validation of prior year expenditures.

Amendment No. 13—Operation and maintenance, Navy: Appropriates $2,611,220,000 instead of $2,599,320,000 as proposed by the House and $2,621,720,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14—Operation and maintenance, Navy: Inserts language providing that $5,900,000 be available only to meet increased expenses of maintaining Marine Corps strength, similar to language proposed by the Senate. See amendment number 4.

Amendment No. 15—Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps: Appropriates $175,850,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $171,350,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16—Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps: Inserts language providing that $4,500,000 be available only to meet increased expenses of maintaining Marine Corps strength, similar to language proposed by the Senate. See amendment number 4.

Amendment No. 17—Operation and maintenance, Air Force: Appropriates $4,195,006,000 instead of $4,167,506,000 as proposed by the House and $4,222,506,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18—Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard: Appropriates $151,700,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $157,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19—Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard: Inserts language providing that $5,700,000 be available only to meet increased expenses of maintaining Army National Guard strength, similar to language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20—Contingencies, Department of Defense: Appropriates $15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21—Operation and maintenance, Olympic Winter Games, Department of Defense: Reported in disagreement.

Title III—Procurement

Amendment No. 22—Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army: Appropriates $1,407,300,000 instead of $1,232,300,000 as proposed by the House and $1,450,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23—Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army: Deletes language proposed by the Senate. The Committee of Conference is in agreement that not less than $100,000,000 of the funds available to the Department of the Army for procurement of Nike-Hercules missiles and supporting equipment shall be reprogramed for Army modernization.

Amendment No. 24—Aircraft and related procurement, Navy: Appropriates $1,961,644,000 instead of $1,969,394,000 as proposed by the House and $1,950,294,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25—Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy: Appropriates $1,330,700,000 instead of $1,322,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,636,200,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Committee of Conference is in agreement that $35,000,000 of this amount is available only for long lead-time procurement for a nuclear powered aircraft carrier.

Amendment No. 26—Procurement of ordnance and ammunition, Navy: Appropriates $567,719,000 instead of $627,369,000 as proposed by the House and $564,069,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27—Aircraft procurement, Air Force: Appropriates $4,284,600,000 instead of $4,165,700,000 as proposed by the House and $4,316,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds approved by the Senate for procurement of F-27 aircraft have been deleted.

Amendment No. 28—Aircraft procurement, Air Force: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29—Missile procurement, Air Force: Appropriates $2,540,550,000 instead of $2,448,300,000 as proposed by the House and $2,552,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The committee of conference is in agreement that funds made available for missile procurement, Air Force, shall be available for procurement of the Mace missile, provided that prior to the obligation of funds for this purpose the Secretary of Defense shall certify in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that this missile is essential to the military posture of this country.

Amendment No. 30—Other procurement, Air Force: Appropriates $1,109,650,000 instead of $1,104,100,000 as proposed by the House and $1,115,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31—Other procurement, Air Force: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate.

Title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation

Amendment No. 32—Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army: Appropriates $1,035,715,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,046,515,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33—Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy: Appropriates $1,015,920,000 as proposed by the House instead of $970,920,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34—Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force: Reported in disagreement.

Title V—General provisions

Amendment No. 35: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Limits the availability of funds for legislative liaison activities to $2,650,000 instead of $2,900,000 as proposed by the House and $2,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Reported in disagreement. The committee of conference is in agreement that the necessary functions of the legislative liaison organizations of the Military Departments and the Department of Defense in assisting Members of Congress in doing business with the Department of Defense and the Military Departments should be continued. The purpose of the limitation approved as section 630 is to require the Secretary of Defense to take positive action to curb the activities of liaison personnel which appear to be designed to seek favors for a military service or which otherwise may be considered as perpetuating interservice rivalry or military service partisan influence.

Amendment No. 39: Inserts language proposed by the House pertaining to the allocation of funds for the procurement of commercial air transportation instead of language proposed by the Senate and changes the amount allocated to $85,000,000 instead of $80,000,000 as proposed by the House and $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 41: Changes section number.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
(except as to amendments Nos. 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16 and 19).
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Congress began work on the defense appropriation bill last January. Final action has now been agreed upon in a conference between House and Senate conferees. It is appropriate to discuss what has been done.

The bill as passed by the House was in round figures $400 million below the budget. As passed by the Senate it was $346 million above the budget. In the final version of the bill as contained in the conference report today we have given the Defense Department substantially the amount of dollars requested in the defense budget, but we have made some very significant changes in the defense program. The request was for $39,248,200,000. The appropriation is only $20 million less. The difference in dollars is not significant.

On the other hand we have taken significant actions in an attempt to improve the defense program without increasing the dollars requested. We have made reductions where we thought reductions could safely be made and we have made increases in areas where we thought an attempt should be made to accelerate programs. Within the framework of the budget we have sought to provide a better program for defense than was contained in the January budget.

The defense picture is subject to frequent change. Changes provided by Congress have not been made in a spirit of obstruction, but in a spirit of cooperation and helpfulness. Many of the changes provided by Congress have the support of responsible defense officials, civilian and military. Some of the changes have been completely endorsed by defense officials.

I should like to discuss the final draft of the bill as set forth in the conference report and make special reference to certain features. I shall first deal with significant changes and special features and in conclusion I shall supply a few

tables and general information in regard to the bill.

ARMY

Special consideration was given to the limited war capability of the Army. Funds requested in the budget for Army modernization were considered insufficient. We have provided $375 million above the budget for Army modernization, including the antiballistic missile program. In addition to this, we have provided that no less than an additional $100 million previously budgeted for the Nike-Hercules air defense missile be reprogramed for Army modernization.

ANTIMISSILE MISSILE

The Army has been assigned the task of doing the research and development work on an antiballistic missile missile, known as the Nike-Zeus. The Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile is one of the most serious long-range military threats to the security of this country. A portion of the funds provided above the budget for Army modernization are made available for the anti-ICBM missile. The Secretary of Defense indicates that $137 million of the extra funds which we have provided the Army will be devoted to the Nike-Zeus anti-ICBM missile.

NAVY

ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE

Another of the more serious military threats to the security of the United States is the Soviet submarine fleet. Our control of the seas is endangered. The long-range missile-launching submarine threatens our cities and defense establishments from both the Atlantic and Pacific.

Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, says:

> We need to improve our capability to combat submarines. Since World War II, the submarine has progressed faster than the antisubmarine warfare capability to combat it.

In an effort to accelerate our defense against the submarine we have provided funds above the budget request in the sum of $137 million. Of these extra funds provided, $45 million are earmarked for research and development. A major breakthrough in the techniques of detection and destruction of submarines is urgently required. An additional atomic submarine is also financed by the increase over the budget.

AIRCRAFT CARRIER

The budget contained a request for $260 million for a new attack aircraft carrier. Three new attack carriers are now under construction. In addition to the carriers under construction there are 23 in the active fleet, of which 14 are attack carriers and 9 are antisubmarine warfare carriers.

The defense appropriation bill as passed by the House contained no funds for a new aircraft carrier. The House, however, provided the sum of $255 million above the budget for antisubmarine warfare.

In compromising the differences between the House and Senate versions of the defense bill it was agreed that funds provided above the budget by the House for antisubmarine warfare would be reduced to $137 million and $35 million would be appropriated for the design of a nuclear-powered attack carrier and for the procurement of long leadtime items. Some Members felt that the question of providing an additional aircraft carrier should be postponed. As a compromise they considered procurement of long leadtime items for a modern nuclear carrier a wiser action than the financing of a nonnuclear ship which would, in a measure be obsolescent before it joined the fleet in about 1963 or 1964.

The estimated cost of the nuclear attack carrier is $380 million. But this is a preliminary estimate and the final cost will no doubt run to a much higher figure.

Estimates have recently gone up on the cost of the nuclear carrier now under construction. The original estimate was $314 million. The present estimate is $435 million. Additional costs are anticipated.

AIR FORCE

The bill contains additional funds, as it did when it first passed the House, for acceleration of our long-range ballistic missile programs. Extra funds above the budget estimates are provided in the amount of $172 million for the immediate procurement required toward attaining a 17-squadron Atlas missile program, instead of the 9 squadrons provided for in the budget, and for accelerating development of the Minuteman solid-propellant ICBM. These additional funds are provided in an effort to close the missile gap.

The budget contained $127 million for a tactical nonballistic missile known as the Mace. Funds for this missile were eliminated on the ground that the missile is of marginal value. However, in the final action the Air Force is authorized to use any available funds, not otherwise required, for this missile provided that prior to the obligation of funds for this purpose the Secretary of Defense shall certify in writing to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate that the missile is essential to the military posture of this country.

In addition, the Congress has eliminated funds for procurement of commercial-type cargo jet transports, the so-called C-jets, requested by the Air Force. Further studies as to MATS modernization need to be made.

ADDED FLEXIBILITY GRANTED FOR STRATEGIC AND TACTICAL MISSILES

To assist in assuring adequate funds for essential missile programs the committee of conference worked out language as a substitute to the Senate version of section 633 granting $150 million of additional transfer authority to the emergency fund. This authority is limited, however, to the acceleration of strategic and tactical missile programs. It cannot be used for any other purpose.

At present the emergency fund is limited to use for research, development, test, and evaluation, or procurement or production related thereto. These are the significant words in the appropriation language. The language which provides for the emergency fund carries an appropriation of $150 million plus authority to transfer an additional $150 million for the purposes specified. There is also a limitation of 7 percent on the amount which can be transferred from any single appropriation. The section 633 language in the pending measure relates to the emergency fund language and carries the same limitations except to the extent that the emergency fund language is broadened for the purpose of carrying out the intent of section 633. The intent here is, of course, the acceleration of strategic and tactical missile programs should the Secretary of Defense deem it advantageous to the national defense.

AIR DEFENSE

One of the most difficult and controversial problems before the House and Senate Appropriations Committee was the question of air defense; that is, continental air defense against possible attack by enemy aircraft.

In the hearings it was developed that over the period of the last 10 years we have spent about $29 billion on defense against manned aircraft. It was estimated that this figure by 1963 could run to $49 billion. A bitter controversy arose over the relative merits of the Nike-Hercules missile of the Army and the Bomarc missile of the Air Force. Waste and lost motion were indicated. The Committee called for a high level reevaluation of the whole problem of air defense. The House made certain cuts in appropriations for the purpose of focusing attention on the issue and securing high level decisions.

Final action on this issue was as follows: Defense officials agreed upon a master plan which provided for an overall reduction, below the budget, of $32,800,000 in the Bomarc missile program and reprograming of $76,800,000 of fiscal year 1959 funds in the Nike-Hercules program of the Army.

When the Senate passed the defense appropriation bill it reduced the Nike-Hercules and the Bomarc programs below the master plan. An additional $41 million of Nike-Hercules funds were reprogramed for Army modernization. The additional reduction in the Bomarc program was $50 million.

In conference the Senate figure on Bomarc was accepted and not less than $100 million of funds available for Nike-Hercules was made available for Army modernization. The master plan figure was $76.8 million. The original Senate bill figure was $117.8 million.

This action was probably wise but my personal view was that it would probably have been better to have approved in toto the so-called master plan agreement which was submitted by the Pentagon. However, in view of the fact that neither the Nike-Hercules nor the Bomarc affords a defense against ballistic missiles and neither program affords the ideal answer to the need for defense against manned bombers, the action of the conference can be well defended.

Congressional action on fiscal year 1960 defense appropriation bill

Title	Appropriations, 1959	Budget estimates, 1960	Recommended in House bill, 1960	House bill compared with estimates, 1960	Recommended in Senate bill, 1960	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		Conference bill	Increase (+) or decrease (−), conference bill compared with—			
						Estimates, 1960	House bill, 1960		Appropriations, 1959	Estimates, 1960	House bill, 1960	Senate bill, 1960
Title I—Military personnel	$11,809,409,000	$11,624,924,000	$11,614,624,000	−$10,300,000	$11,618,324,000	−$6,600,000	+$3,700,000	$11,638,324,000	−$171,085,000	+$13,400,000	+$23,700,000	+20,000,000
Title II—Operation and maintenance	10,055,281,800	10,502,978,000	10,403,367,000	−99,611,000	10,485,367,000	−17,611,000	+82,000,000	10,437,367,000	+382,085,200	−65,611,000	+34,000,000	−48,000,000
Title III—Procurement	15,263,563,000	13,347,963,000	13,003,013,000	−344,950,000	13,719,113,000	+371,150,000	+716,100,000	13,336,013,000	−1,927,550,000	−11,950,000	+333,000,000	−383,100,000
Title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	2,759,953,300	3,772,335,000	3,827,335,000	+55,000,000	3,771,535,000	−800,000	−55,800,000	3,816,535,000	+1,056,581,700	+44,200,000	−10,800,000	+45,000,000
Total, titles I, II, III, and IV	39,888,207,100	39,248,200,000	38,848,339,000	−399,861,000	39,594,339,000	+346,139,000	+746,000,000	39,228,239,000	−659,968,100	−19,961,000	+379,900,000	−366,100,000
Distribution of appropriations by organizational component:												
Army	9,051,701,200	8,985,000,000	9,206,905,000	+221,905,000	9,428,505,000	+443,505,000	+221,600,000	9,375,805,000	+324,103,800	+390,805,000	+168,900,000	−52,700,000
Navy	11,480,310,400	11,107,775,000	11,025,103,000	−82,672,000	11,262,503,000	+154,728,000	+237,400,000	11,006,503,000	−473,807,400	−101,272,000	−18,600,000	−256,000,000
Air Force	17,982,276,800	17,767,200,000	17,228,506,000	−538,694,000	17,530,106,000	−237,094,000	+301,600,000	17,472,706,000	−509,570,800	−294,494,000	+244,200,000	−57,400,000
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,373,918,700	1,388,225,000	1,387,825,000	−400,000	1,373,225,000	−15,000,000	−14,600,000	1,373,225,000	−693,700	−15,000,000	−14,600,000	----------
Total, Department of Defense	39,888,207,100	39,248,200,000	38,848,339,000	−399,861,000	39,594,339,000	+346,139,000	+746,000,000	39,228,239,000	−659,968,100	−19,961,000	+379,900,000	−366,100,000

PERSONNEL FLOORS

Something should be said about personnel floors. Last year the Senate placed mandatory riders on the defense appropriation bill, requiring that the Army should be maintained at an average strength of 900,000; the Marines at 200,000; National Guard at 400,000 and the Reserves at 300,000. As a compromise in conference between the House and Senate, the mandatory floors for the Army and the Marines were stricken out. The mandatory floors for the guard and the Reserves were approved. This year the Senate provided mandatory floors for the Guard, Reserves, and Marines, but not for the Army.

It is my feeling that legislative matters of this type should not be dealt with by riders on appropriation bills. I feel that these matters should be studied and handled from the standpoint of legislation by the legislative committees of the House and Senate. The executive branch raises a very serious constitutional question in regard to mandatory floors. The Committee on Appropriations has not conducted any hearings on the constitutional aspects of this issue.

I repeat, my personal feeling is that these matters can best be handled through channels other than the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. I would like to see the National Guard maintained on a stable basis and I would like to see similar consideration given to the Army Reserves. I think the 400,000 and the 300,000 figures are good and I support them. I have long felt that the Marines should be maintained at 200,000. In the original defense appropriation bill last year the House provided funds to support a Marine Corps of 200,000 men. In the conference with the Senate this year the House conferees agreed on funds for the additional strength above the budgeted figure.

I realize that many Members of Congress and many citizens generally feel strongly that mandatory language should be included in the bill for the Marines, as well as for the Army, National Guard, and Reserves. The next step in this direction would be a mandatory personnel floor for the Navy and for the Air Force.

I simply do not believe that it is practical at this time for the House Committee on Appropriations to fix rigid personnel floors on military personnel. Our duties in connection with a $40 billion defense appropriation bill should not include this responsibility. These issues, I again say, should be dealt with through the House and Senate Armed Services Committees. It is difficult for me to see how logical objections could be made to the course which I suggest.

Now if it ultimately appears to be necessary after a few more years of pulling and hauling on this issue for the Committee on Appropriations to take over and fix personnel floors for the Regular services and for all the Reserve forces, and if it is held within the jurisdiction of Congress to do so, then I shall be glad to do what I can to help achieve good results; but, for the time being, I should like to postpone that date and seek to resolve these issues through processes which appear more logical. I do not want to appear to be wholly inflexible in this matter.

SUMMARY OF BILL

I have inserted in the RECORD a summary tabulation of the bill reflecting the progress of the bill through the Congress, showing the changes made at various stages in the totals for the respective titles and for the respective military departments.

MAJOR FORCES PROVIDED

The true strength of our military forces can only be partially shown by numbers, organizational units and major units of equipment. Such statistics do not reflect real combat capabilities. Nevertheless, these statistics are useful for year-to-year comparisons and as an indication of the vast effort which goes into our defense program. This effort is effectively depicted in the following tabulation summary of major forces:

Department of Defense—Summary of major forces, fiscal years 1958–60

	Actual		Planned—President's fiscal year 1960 budget, June 30, 1960	Provided in the conference bill
	June 30, 1958	June 30, 1959		
Department of the Army:				
Divisions	15	15	14	14
Regiments ROT's	5	5	5	5
Armored combat commands	1	1	1	1
Brigades (infantry)	2	2	2	2
Battle groups (infantry)	[1] 6	8	8	8
Field artillery missile groups (heavy)	2	3	3	3
U.S. Army missile commands	4	4	4	4
Air defense artillery battalions	(87)	(85)	(80¼)	(80¼)
Guided missile battalions	65	73	73¼	73¼
Other	22	12	7	7
Active duty military personnel	898,192	861,294	870,000	870,000
Reserve components personnel (drill-pay status)	667,012	707,375	630,000	700,000
Army National Guard	394,329	399,427	360,000	400,000
Army Reserve	272,683	[2] 307,948	270,000	300,000
Average direct hire civilian employment	413,748	410,318	404,679	401,891
Active aircraft inventory	5,027	5,394	5,363	5,363
Helicopter	2,193	2,438	2,558	2,558
Fixed wing	2,834	2,956	2,805	2,805
Department of the Navy:				
Active ships	891	[3] 847	864	864
Warships	396	376	389	389
Other ships	495	471	475	475
Carrier air groups	17	16	16	16
Carrier antisubmarine squadrons	22	22	22	22
Patrol and warning squadrons	39	42	42	42
Marine divisions	3	3	3	3
Marine aircraft wings	3	3	3	3
Active duty military personnel	830,500	801,174	805,000	830,000
Navy	641,005	[4] 625,336	630,000	630,000
Marine Corps	189,495	[4] 175,838	175,000	200,000
Department of the Navy—Continued				
Reserve components personnel (drill pay status)	172,367	164,083	177,811	177,811
Naval Reserve	129,632	[5] 121,593	135,000	135,000
Marine Corps Reserve	42,735	[5] 42,490	42,811	42,811
Average direct hire civilian employment	371,815	359,134	359,511	357,702
Active aircraft inventory	10,533	9,649	9,117	9,117
Operating aircraft	8,424	7,562	7,200	7,200
Logistical support aircraft	2,109	2,087	1,917	1,917
Jet aircraft as percent of aircraft inventory	(42)	(44)	(45)	(45)
Department of the Air Force:				
U.S. Air Force combat wings (including missile wings)	117	105	102	102
Strategic	44	43	43	43
Air defense	28	27	25	25
Tactical (including airlift)	45	35	34	34
U.S. Air Force combat support forces:				
Air refueling squadrons	48	55	63	63
MATS squadrons	27	27	24	24
Other specialized squadrons	62	58	58	58
Active duty military personnel	871,156	840,435	845,000	845,000
Reserve components personnel (drill-pay status)	118,282	125,738	135,060	135,060
Air National Guard	69,995	70,994	74,500	74,500
Air Force Reserve	48,287	54,744	60,560	60,560
Average direct hire civilian employment	317,318	315,311	313,818	310,957
Active aircraft inventory	22,578	20,890	19,982	19,982
Operating aircraft	18,949	18,260	18,499	18,499
Nonoperating aircraft	3,629	2,630	1,483	1,483
Jet aircraft as percent of aircraft inventory	(62)	(65)	(65)	

[1] Excludes 2 reduced strength infantry battalions redesignated as battle groups for school troop training.
[2] Preliminary. Includes enlisted men undergoing 3 to 6 months active duty training.
[3] On June 30, 1959, there were also 13 ships in "shakedown" status preparatory to joining the fleet.
[4] Preliminary.
[5] As of May 31, 1959.

Some of the highlights of the foregoing table on major forces are explained as follows:

In the field of military personnel, the bill provides for standing forces of slightly over 2½ million men. This includes an Army of 870,000, a Navy of 630,000, a Marine Corps of 200,000 and an Air Force of 845,000. In addition to these regular forces, National Guard and Reserve organizations of the various services with a combined strength of 1,012,871 in a training pay status are provided for in this bill. These figures exclude some 3,350,000 military personnel now on the rolls of Reserve and National Guard organizations who would be available for military service in event of a general emergency.

Under this bill, the Army will have 870,000 personnel with which to man 14 combat divisions including 73 guided missile battalions personnel to provide training, staff, and logistic support for worldwide deployment.

The Navy will continue a 630,000 man force to handle the operation of 864 ships, and 7,200 aircraft. This is a continuation of the same force levels that existed in fiscal year 1959. The warships of the fleet will include 14 attack carriers, 14 cruisers, 238 destroyer types, and 113 submarines. The manning level of the ships will be continued at 81.2 percent.

In considering the Marine Corps, the committee of conference agreed with the action of the Senate in increasing the strength of the Regular Marine Corps from 175,000 to 200,000 for fiscal year 1960. This will enable the Marine Corps to provide combat manning for the three-division three-airwing force it is required by law to maintain.

The Air Force will have on active duty 845,000 military personnel during fiscal year 1960. These personnel will man 102 combat air wings—including missile wings—with an active aircraft inventory of nearly 20,000 planes. The combat forces are divided into 25 air defense wings, 34 tactical wings—including airlift—and 43 strategic airwings. This bill provides and encourages the orderly transition from manned aircraft to missile warfare, and Air Force personnel are being intensively trained to utilize these advanced weapons systems.

Now, let us consider briefly the Reserve and National Guard forces. This bill provides for a combined strength of slightly over 1 million for the three services, as follows:

Army National Guard	400,000
Air National Guard	74,500
Total National Guard	474,500
Army Reserve	300,000
Naval Reserve	135,000
Air Force Reserve	60,560
Marine Corps Reserve	42,811
Total Reserve	538,371
Grand total	1,012,871

These strengths are based on the budget recommendations with the exceptions of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve. The budget proposal for the Army National Guard was 360,000 and 270,000 for the Army Reserve. Again this year, however, Congress continued the strengths of these two components at the higher levels and the bill contains funds for that purpose.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that $35 million is earmarked for preliminary work on a nuclear carrier, that it cannot be spent for anything else?

Mr. MAHON. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am disappointed at not having the larger amount, but I am grateful for this.

Mr. MAHON. In my prepared remarks I elaborate on this issue.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LANKFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question about section 631 as adopted by the conference. As the term "Commercial Air Transportation Service" is used in there, does that mean service performed by air carriers?

Mr. MAHON. When the bill passed the House of Representatives in June it contained certain provisions. Over in the other body changes were made both in the committee and on the floor of the other body in this section. In conference the language of the House was adopted in toto and the language of the other body was stricken, with this exception: The $80 million provided in the House version of the bill was raised in conference to $85 million. With this $85 million the Air Force will have authority to procure transportation. It can procure such transportation from any carrier which is regarded as adequate and competent by the Air Force.

The language is as follows:

> Of the funds made available by this act for the services of the Military Air Transport Service, $85,000,000 shall be available only for procurement of commercial air transportation service; and the Secretary of Defense shall utilize the services of civil air carriers which qualify as small businesses to the fullest extent found practicable.

I realize that the organizations of air carriers want the number of those that can participate in this program restricted to those that are certificated by the CAB as scheduled and supplemental carriers. The language in the House bill does not require this, but all carriers must meet the safety regulations which are laid down by the Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. LANKFORD. Then the term "air carrier" has the same meaning in this bill as it has in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958?

Mr. MAHON. I believe it would not.

Mr. LANKFORD. It would not?

Mr. MAHON. Because the authority of the Air Force and the Department of Defense is a little broader. One of the reasons for this is that it gives a larger latitude for small business in this field. It just seems to me that it would probably be a good idea to study this whole thing from beginning to end and come up with a legislative bill, not an appropriation bill, that would deal adequately with this issue. It is one of the most controversial portions of the bill, and there has been a lot of pulling and hauling, but the committee has stayed with the House language, feeling that this is the best that can be done at this time.

Mr. LANKFORD. Would the gentleman say that this language means that any operator who is not qualified as an air carrier as defined in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is ineligible to bid on the MATS commercial organization? In other words, in order to bid in on this MATS organization, would he have to be qualified as an air carrier as defined in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958?

Mr. MAHON. I do not understand that he would have to be so qualified. I would like to elaborate a little more on this answer. We have the common carrier people. Now, the common carrier people would like to get all possible business that is available through this section, but there is wide latitude in the Department of Defense in the selection of contracts. As long as the air carrier can meet the requirements of safety laid down by the FAA and other requirements laid down by the Department of Defense, then he is permitted to undertake to get part of this business.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. When the gentleman uses the words "air carrier" and "transportation," the gentleman means to include cargo carriers certificated by the CAB as well?

Mr. MAHON. Cargo carriers certificated by CAB are included. The little carriers, the big carriers, the certificated carriers, the noncertificated carriers are included in this broad language.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is giving his own personal interpretation of this language. He is not adjudicating it here but giving his personal interpretation of what it means.

Mr. MAHON. That is right. This is the same language that was carried last year in the bill, and I am giving it the same interpretation that it received in the Department of Defense last year.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is aware that our concern here today—that is, the concern of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] and others—is that when these MATS contracts are offered, people come in who have never been in the airline business and bid and bid down so low that they go out and buy an aircraft or two and take business away overnight, and the small operators who are trying to exist today, who are on the verge of destruction, are getting further into trouble, and that is your problem.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct that a problem lies in this area. We should not have tissue paper organizations in this operation so far as I am concerned. I think the Air Force has probably gone too far in extending the privilege of contracting to people who do not have sufficient stability and reliability. So, I think the operation needs to be tightened up. But, we did not feel that we should undertake to write a complex law with respect to air carriers in this appropriation bill.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he feels that in the interest of providing maximum safety for the men and women of our Armed Forces who occasionally ride as passengers under this commercial service utilized by the Military Air Transport Service, the gentleman would agree with me that every item involving safety, every item involving qualification of the carrier, should and must be taken into consideration by the Department of Defense in making this determination in which the Department has been given broad latitude in this bill.

Mr. MAHON. I believe that the Department of Defense should take into consideration the reliability of the carrier and certainly the safety of the carrier. We are all aware that the major scheduled carriers of the country have had disastrous accidents and the charter-type carriers have had disastrous accidents. There is no complete assurance of safety in MATS, but the Air Force and the Department of Defense should do everything in their power to get the safest and most reliable transportation that may be available but should follow the language of this provision which gives preference to small business and gives considerable latitude in the Department of Defense.

Mr. FLYNT. But the gentleman does feel that they should be bona fide air carriers within the meaning of the definition as set out in the Federal Aviation Act.

Mr. MAHON. I would not say that. We leave a broader field of administration here for the Department of Defense. It is up to the officials of the Department of Defense to make the selection, and they have been warned before and they are warned now that they must do everything in their power, irrespective of cost, to insure reliable and safe transportation for the men and women of the armed services.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the purpose of this augmentation of MATS?

Mr. MAHON. This is an attempt to prevent any further augmentation of MATS. This does not provide additional funds for the operation of MATS. It does provide that of funds available they shall utilize the commercial carriers.

Mr. GROSS. Did not the gentleman say that they were appropriating $85 million for the purpose of contracting the services?

Mr. MAHON. This is not an appropriation here. This is an assignment of $85 million of funds to be used for contracting with air carriers for service.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly. So you are augmenting the facilities of MATS, the service of MATS, are you not?

Mr. MAHON. MATS would have the authority without this language to make contracts and to carry cargo on its own. This is taking away from MATS. This language is opposed by the Air Force. The Air Force and the Department of Defense would prefer no limitation here. This is an attempt by Congress to help small business and to help commercial airlines.

Mr. GROSS. What I am concerned about is this. Is it contemplated that there is going to be a mass movement of junketeers this fall? Is that what some of this money is necessary for?

Mr. MAHON. The movement of nondefense cargo would not be handled through this channel.

Mr. GROSS. It could be, could it not?

Mr. MAHON. This money provides for flying cargo and personnel on commercial, rather than military, aircraft.

Mr. GROSS. Members of Congress taking a junket to Europe—why would they not come in?

Mr. MAHON. They might go on the MATS fleet. This $85 million is for commercial transportation.

Mr. GROSS. But which is contracted for by MATS?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. So, if you were short a plane in order to take care of a plane load of Members of Congress over there, you could go out and contract for it, could you not?

Mr. MAHON. I do not think that kind of procedure has been followed or would be followed or should be followed.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows that there is going to be a real exodus this fall, does he not?

Mr. MAHON. Next fall.

Mr. GROSS. No; this fall, not next fall. They will have something else to do next fall. They will be having a campaign for their lives next year.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Did the committee give any consideration to treating MATS and Air Transport in the same way that we treat the merchant marine, by dividing up this Government business, so that 50 percent of it will go to the cargo carriers, certificated cargo carriers, and help to build up an air cargo fleet?

Mr. MAHON. As a reserve that we can be sure to have in the event of an all-out emergency, we need MATS. If there were no possibility of war we could dispose of MATS and turn this over to the commercial carriers. But we have to maintain the capacity of MATS at a certain level. The commercial aircraft say it should be much lower. Many in the Air Force say it should be much higher. We are caught in that kind of controversy and this is the best solution we could arrive at on this issue.

Mr. YOUNGER. That same controversy has taken place in regard to the merchant marine. The policy has been laid down by Congress on numerous occasions, in order to keep a merchant fleet available for emergency, that 50 percent of Government business must go in American bottoms. Why cannot we adopt the same policy in the air?

Mr. MAHON. We have Sea Transport, as the gentleman knows. But there is no opportunity to deal with that area at this time. I know the committee would be delighted to have the gentleman appear and outline a program which he thinks is feasible. I am sure that he would receive consideration.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has been eminently fair in trying to arrive at a solution so that we would retain the effectiveness and the capabilities of MATS and the ability of MATS to keep up its proficiency which, in time of emergency, would mean that we would have a MATS capable of carrying out its assignment. Under the present program, MATS is compelled to make certain contracts with certain commercial carriers. Now here is my question. I hope the discussion would not make it possible for an interpretation to be given to this provision of the conference report or the bill that anyone who is not completely qualified would be able to slip in under some provision of law and get business for which they are not qualified.

Mr. MAHON. No action should be taken which would permit anyone to have any business to carry cargo or personnel unless the carrier is qualified in every respect. That is the responsibility of the Department of Defense and it must carry it out.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Under the Federal Aviation Act which outlines certain financial and certain safety regulations both for freight and personnel, does not the gentleman think that the provision of law should be interpreted by the Department of Defense in the awarding of any of the contracts?

Mr. MAHON. I think the Department of Defense should take into consideration all laws and regulations, as well as commonsense, and the action of Congress in section 631, and I feel sure that such action will be taken. I hope a good job will be done. There is no doubt some room for improvement, but I do not know how we could achieve improvement in this action today.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We made a study of this problem in the Committee on Armed Services. I have heard of cases where people have bid for and have been awarded contracts to carry MATS business and yet they did not possess one airplane. The gentleman certainly would not want any condition like that to obtain whereby an unqualified man should be permitted to be awarded any contract.

Mr. MAHON. That would be shoddy business practice and indicate poor management. That is the reason I say the Department of Defense is warned to handle this business in a workmanlike, safe, and stable way.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. And we would not want fly-by-nighters to get in under any possible interpretation of the law. Is that not correct?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Would the chairman of the committee speak to amendment No. 23 briefly? That has to do with procurement. I notice you say the committee of conference is in agreement that not less than $100 million of funds available for Army procurement of Nike-Hercules missiles and supporting equipment shall be reprogramed for Army modernization. Do you mean reprogramed in fields other than the Nike-Hercules missiles?

Mr. MAHON. It would be in Army modernization. In previous appropriation bills we have provided a great deal of money for Nike-Hercules and the air defense program. This whole question has been resurveyed and restudied by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense and others. They have come up with a master plan. That has brought about a condition wherein they have more money for Nike-Hercules air defense missiles than is required. We state that these additional funds, which we claim to be $100 million at this particular point and which the Department of Defense says is a lesser sum, that these particular sums can be reprogramed from Nike-Hercules to Army modernization.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. FORD. In reference to the inquiry by the gentleman from North Carolina, it should be stated that the other body wrote in a proviso which reads as follows:

Provided, That $117,800,000 of the funds available to the Department of the Army for procurement of Nike-Hercules missiles and supporting equipment shall be reprogramed for Army modernization.

In the conference we struck that legislation, which was an impounding and an earmarking, from the bill and substituted instead language in the conference report with a lesser dollar amount.

Mr. JONAS. There is nothing in the report that would restrict or impinge upon the authority of the Army to go forward with the master plan? You are not taking any money away there?

Mr. MAHON. There is a reduction of about $40 million, I believe, in the Army and about $50 million in the Air Force, a reduction which was agreed to in the other body and agreed to in the conference. That is, there is a reduction in the master plan to that extent. I do not know whether that was wise or not. I personally would have gone along with the master plan 100 percent at this time. But that was not the final decision. And of course there are two sides to this question.

Mr. JONAS. I certainly agree with the chairman. I would question the advisability of cutting this procurement.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman again yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to commend the House conferences for their wisdom in providing funds for the commencement of construction of a new and second nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier. Is it the fact that a commitment has been made to furnish funds in the next year for the completion of this nuclear carrier?

Mr. MAHON. I would not say any commitment has been made. This session of the Congress could not, I think, bind the next session of the Congress.

Mr. ROONEY. Why not?

Mr. MAHON. What we did was to provide $35 million for design and long-lead-time items. If the Bureau of the Budget and the President next year request funds for the completion of the carrier for which $35 million is provided in this bill and there are no important unforeseen developments, I anticipate the funds will be provided. Insofar as I am concerned the issue barring unforeseen developments has now been resolved on the second nuclear carrier. But these issues will be decided not by me but by the Congress itself in its regular procedures.

Mr. ROONEY. Are there in effect any commitments that if the executive branch asks for the balance of the funds, as we expect they will, the committee will furnish them?

Mr. MAHON. There is no committee commitment of which I know. I am expressing my own individual views.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman from Texas is aware of the fact that the Subcommittee on Military Operations made a study of the MATS operation and referred their studies and recommendations to the gentleman for his consideration during the hearings on the appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. The studies and recommendations were helpful.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I wish to compliment the conferees on their earmarking of this sum of $85 million for the commercial program by the MATS organization and I want again to call to the gentleman's attention the fact that there is what is known as the Civil Reserve Air Fleet whereby commercial carriers of personnel and cargo can by adding certain modifications to their planes apply for the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, which is a standby emergency fleet for use in time of war.

It is my hope that the committee in its deliberations in the future will take into consideration the merits of having augmented and increased capability in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet; in other words, I believe in this contracting of military procurement where it seems to be advisable. I also believe in the maintaining of a strong MATS organization, but I think the two can be worked out together into a coordinated whole for emergency use in time of war, and I hope the gentleman's committee will consider that carefully.

Mr. MAHON. I would say to the gentleman that the committee is very much concerned about this Civil Reserve Air Fleet, and we believe without exception that the Air Force should do everything reasonably possible to augment this Civil Reserve Fleet. That is one of the matters that will be given continued study by the committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And one of the things that MATS can do in their contracting for services is to require these commercial organizations to make the necessary adaptations of their planes and make precontracts with their employees so that in time of war they could smoothly go into operation for the defense of the Nation.

Mr. MAHON. It does seem to me that the Air Force in making its contracts with these commercial carriers should undertake it with the idea of augmenting the Civil Reserve Air Fleet.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if national defense is to be made effective, if the Nation is to be strengthened against the greatest threat ever made against it in history—it must be done in this national defense bill.

If this bill is deficient, if it fails to prepare the Nation to meet this unprecedented situation then we risk the wreckage of every major American city and a holocaust in which 20 to 30 millions of our people will die without a chance to strike back. Only this bill stands between us and that catastrophe.

Mr. Speaker, there is one fact which stands out like the headlight on a locomotive at midnight.

It cannot be denied. It cannot be evaded. It cannot be palliated. It cannot be hidden. It stands out stark and grim and menacing against every horizon.

Since 1945 the United States has steadily declined in relative military strength as a world power.

Do not entertain any disillusions about that. There is universal agreement by every competent disinterested authority that every year has found the United States relatively weaker in armament and less influential in world affairs. Every year the United States has been less able to defend itself and its allies. And as a result of that growing weakness we have every year less ardent friends and more aggressive enemies.

But the situation is more alarming than that.

Every year since 1945 Russia has steadily grown in relative military strength as a world power.

Today Russia has more planes than the United States; more tanks, more missiles, more modern rifles, more submarines than the United States. And vastly more men trained and equipped and ready to move at 6 o'clock tomorrow morning.

If anyone here on the floor questions that let him come forward with the proof.

The decline of the United States from a position of commanding military superiority—and the rise of Russia from a fourth-rate power to first rank among the nations of the earth in the last decade is one of the most astounding developments in ancient or modern history—and one of the most alarming.

Mr. Speaker, at the close of the Second World War we had the greatest Navy, the greatest Army, the greatest Air Fleet, the greatest scientific corps, and the greatest industrial capacity of any nation on earth.

So commanding was our position that we did not even negotiate.

We did not confer with Germany or Japan on the terms of surrender. We did not meet in any conferences at Geneva. We did not hold any meetings at the summit, we did not leave unsettled the status of any American national as a prisoner of war. We did not have brush fires kindling anywhere in neutral countries. We wrote out the terms of surrender and said, "Sign" and they signed.

How different is the situation today.

Mr. Speaker, what has brought about this remarkable change? I ask you men, sitting here as Members of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, what has brought about this incredible change in the relative position of the United States and Russia in so short a time? What is the answer?

It is very simple. It is this bill. It has been the bill which we are now considering and the bills which preceded it in former years. It has been these bills and these conference reports.

There is no other explanation. We have failed in our military bills to keep the superiority which was ours in the beginning. We had every advantage. We initiated these weapons. We invented the airplane, we invented the submarine, we invented the atomic bomb. And then Russia, just emerging from barbarism—coming from behind—with every handicap took them away from us and through her mastery of these weapons is dictating to us today.

Never before, Mr. Speaker, in all the years of the Republic, have we been so insulted and so ridiculed before the nations of the world. Never before has an ultimatum been issued to us by a foreign power.

Our planes have been shot down and we did not even dare to inquire or investigate. Our newspapers hushed it up. Our nationals have been detained in foreign countries and we have been unable to secure their release. What a contrast with the day when Teddy Roosevelt cabled across the seas "Pericardis alive or Razuli dead." But then we were a power, and in 6 hours the American citizen was on his way home. We could not do that today.

We have received orders to withdraw every SAC base in the Arctic Circle and only the most desperate measures have held it in abeyance.

France has ordered us out of her territory. France, whom we twice reestablished as a Nation, has told us to get our bases off French soil. And we are getting out precipitately.

And now we are inviting over here a man whom we said, in every diplomatic language spoken, we would not invite; a man who from his first diplomatic utterance has said that Russia and the United States cannot exist in the same world; who has said the next world war will be fought in the United States and who has promised to bury us; a man who has ridiculed and denounced our religion, our institutions and our efforts to establish world peace, and openly used language in denouncing us released to the press in the last 2 weeks which was unprintable.

The State Department representatives said repeatedly and emphatically he would not be received in the United States.

But now we are inviting him over with a great display of friendship. We are making him respectable and rehabilitating him in the eyes of the world. We are conferring on him the recognition which he will use with neutral nations to further embarrass and exploit us. It will not placate him. It will merely make him more dangerous. He comes as the exponent, the emissary, the advocate of world communism. He is now equipped to defeat us both in the field and at the council table.

What has brought this about? What has made this debacle possible?

One thing and one thing alone.

We stand today exactly where Chamberlain stood when he met Hitler at Munich. Hitler had the planes. England was deficient in air power. Today Khrushchev has the missiles and the submarines. We are deficient in both. We have frittered away on carriers the time and attention and money we should have devoted to the missile and the submarine.

For the last dozen years our military program has paralleled the Russian program. Both nations in their race for supremacy have followed practically the same pattern—with one exception.

We have devoted money and strategic material and technicians and scientists to the carrier—the most costly and the most vulnerable military weapon ever built. Russia has been too wise to build a single carrier. They have copied every weapon we have devised except the carrier.

That has been for the last decade the only difference in the military programs of the two nations. And as result America has dropped every year in relative military power and Russia has risen every year in world priority. There can be no other explanation. It is as simple as that. It is the carrier.

If we had bestowed on missiles and submarines the emphasis, the attention and the resources we have wasted on carriers, we would today be as potent in world affairs, and our people would be as safe, as in 1945.

Mr. Speaker, we should commend the subcommittee, and especially its great chairman, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. MAHON, for the admirable way in which they have met a difficult situation and for the bill which they report today for final action.

They are alert to the trend of the times. They eliminated the carrier and they emphasized the missile and the submarine. And they did it without excessive expenditure. As has been said here before, it is not the amount of money we spend in national defense. It is how that amount is allocated and expended.

Unfortunately the other body clings tenaciously to the past. They amended the bill to include a nuclear carrier—gasoline on the flames which would still further sink American hopes and American security. We rejected the carrier in conference but had to include $35 million for planning. But undoubtedly the rapidly accelerating obsolence of surface ships will by the time the next bill is reported prevent the building of another carrier to further increase the discrepancy between American and Russian power and prosperity.

Unfortunately most of the debate on the conference report here today has been on who will get the contracts. Not a word has been said about adequate national defense.

Mr. Speaker, we are not interested so much in who gets the contracts and who gets the business and who makes the profits and the money.

All we want to do here today is to keep the Russians out of the United States.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this conference report basically carries out the Defense Department program recommended by the President, with modifications which I think improve the program. The total amount involved in new obligational authority is approximately what the President recommended in January.

The point should be made here today that this legislation improves the Strategic Air Command's striking ability both in aircraft and in missiles. It will implement our Air Defense Command, making it a better operation. The whole Air Force is improved in personnel and equipment.

This conference report will improve the Navy's striking power. It will provide a nuclear carrier, our second nuclear carrier. It will give added emphasis and strength to our antisubmarine warfare potential.

This conference report, on behalf of the Army, provides substantial additional funds for the Army's modernization program. All in all it can be said that this conference report adds to and implements our military strength in all three services.

Of course, as of today we are the strongest military power in the world and this program will keep us in that position. I would like, however, to talk about one or two technical parts of the legislation.

It would appear that the conference report brings about a $19,961,000 reduction in the President's recommendations for new obligational authority. Actually the conference report does reduce new obligational authority to the extent of $19,961,000. However, that will not bring

about a corresponding reduction in the expenditure figure in fiscal 1960 because the House and the Senate and the conference report make some changes in what we call transfers from the stock funds and the industrial funds. In reality, this conference report will at least maintain the President's expenditure forecasts for fiscal year 1960.

The House and Senate transferred an additional $81 million in obligational authority from the Army stock fund to the Army personnel account. This transfer of obligational authority from the stock fund to the Army personnel account will result in $81 million in expenditures in fiscal 1960, although the transfer on the surface helps to bring about this $19 million reduction in new obligational authority in fiscal 1960.

In addition, the conference report approves a $9 million transfer from the Marine Corps stock fund to the Marine Corps personnel account, above the budget estimate. The net effect of this is to decrease the apparent new obligational authority in fiscal 1960. At the same time there is no reduction in expenditures below the budget.

I just want to emphasize again that although we have apparently reduced the obligational figure below the President's budget, in effect we are not making any reduction in the expenditure program for the fiscal year.

Let me turn to the conference report and ask that you look at page 8. You will have noted there that I, as a conferee, took exception to the action by the House conferees on amendments Nos. 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, and 19. Those were amendments added by the Senate. As a House conferee I did not agree to the decisions of the House and Senate conferees in going along basically with these Senate amendments. They all refer to mandatory floors on the Army National Guard, or the earmarking of certain funds in various accounts for the Army National Guard, the Army Reserve, or the Marine Corps active duty strength.

The House bill did not contain any floors for the Reserve or the National Guard. I think the House bill was right and the Senate version was wrong. I am against floors on appropriation bills for any service, active or reserve. If the House Committee on Armed Services and the corresponding committee in the Senate want to write that kind of legislation they should do it. We should not do it on an appropriation bill. The Committee on Appropriations is altogether too frequently criticized for writing legislation on an appropriation bill. We should avoid that criticism by abstaining from such amendments. In my judgment we should not have this kind of legislation here before us today.

As I previously mentioned, the other body earmarked certain funds for the Marine Corps, for the Army Reserves, and the Army National Guard. They said if a portion of the funds out of a total were to be spent, they had to be spent for a specific purpose. I do not believe in the long run this is to the advantage of the Congress, to earmark funds whether it is for the active-duty forces or for the Reserve forces. For those reasons I objected to the action taken by the House conferees on those amendments which I indicated. I believe the Army National Guard should be kept at 400,000. I believe the Army Reserve should be kept at 300,000. But I am opposed to mandatory floors, and I am opposed to the earmarking of funds.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. In view of the fact that both the Senate and the House deleted $50 million for MATS, can the gentleman explain the action of the other body in putting in $30 million in the supplemental for this purpose?

Mr. FORD. I believe the gentleman from New York refers to the action by the House and by the other body in eliminating $53 million for the proposed Air Force procurement of what we call C-jets. Those are swing-tail modern jet cargo planes. The issue was not in controversy between the House and the other body in the conference because the proposed procurement had been deleted in both instances. I am now told on the supplemental appropriation bill the Appropriations Committee of the other body has included $25 million for a proposed procurement of these same aircraft. They are called C-jets. In addition, the Senate committee added $5 million for research and development in a turbo-fan aircraft. This is an unusual procedure, and it seems to be completely contrary to what the Defense Subcommittee and the House and Senate have just done and are doing. As a conferee I would certainly vigorously oppose these funds in the supplemental appropriation bill, because it is contrary to what our subcommittee in its conference report has agreed to.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. I have one other comment, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the long discussion that the chairman, the gentleman from Texas, had in reference to section 631. This discussion points out the problems we had in conference in trying to resolve this issue presented by amendment to section 631. I believe the House language can be interpreted properly so that the Air Force does business with reliable and responsible contractors. The Air Force has authority under the House language to impose certain responsible restrictions on those who seek business from the Department of Defense. I thought that the Senate committee language was preferable without the language which was added on the floor of the other body. However, the Senate conferees receded so there was no opportunity for the House members of the conference committee to do anything except stand by our own language, which of course is what will now be in the law. The Air Force should not do business with so-called paper organizations. I understand they have accepted bids from commercial contractors who did not hold, by title or by lease, equipment. Then these paper organizations would go out and make a contract with a commercial carrier. That kind of operation should not be condoned. I hope our subcommittee will hold some hearings in the next session to find out to what extent that practice has prevailed.

If that practice is still in existence then we should take firm action in the next session of Congress to prevent it.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Amendment No. 29 would indicate that the conferees added $92 million above the bill as it passed the House for Air Force missile procurement. Is any part of that $92 million for additional Bomarc missiles?

Mr. FORD. Seventy-nine million, nine hundred thousand dollars of that amount was for the purpose of bringing the Bomarc funding partway up to the amount recommended by the Secretary of Defense for the so-called master plan of air defense. The amount recommended by the Secretary was $129.9 million.

Mr. JONAS. Can the gentleman explain why the conferees added money to bring the Bomarc aspect up to the master plan and cut down on the Nike-Hercules below the master plan?

Mr. FORD. As I understand the situation, and the Chairman can correct me, under the master plan the Secretary of Defense said that in the Nike-Hercules program they could take a $76 million reduction. The Senate wrote into the bill language that they should take a $117.8 million reduction. We struck the mandatory language from the bill and said that up to $100 million could be taken from Nike-Hercules and spent for the modernization.

Mr. JONAS. The net result is that we are not up to the master plan with respect to Nike-Hercules, yet we are to bring the Bomarc plan up.

Mr. FORD. There is nothing mandatory in it, and there is a difference of $24 million.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. The master plan on Nike-Hercules was reduced by the Senate by $41 million. The master plan on Bomarc was reduced by $50 million.

Mr. FORD. In conclusion, I would like to say that this is a good defense bill. It is basically the President's recommendations with modifications which the Congress has made, and in most cases all to the good. I have no fear that we have adequate strength militarily not only to protect ourselves but the free world from aggression wherever it might occur.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 6, line 16, insert ": *Provided further,* That the Army National Guard shall be maintained at an

average strength of not less than four hundred thousand for the fiscal year 1960 including not less than fifty-five thousand input into the six months training program during fiscal 1960 and funded from this appropriation: *Provided further,* That $43,000,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses to maintain the Army National Guard at an average strength of four hundred thousand during the fiscal year 1960."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further,* That the Army National Guard shall be maintained at an average strength of not less than four hundred thousand for the fiscal year 1960: *Provided further,* That $43,000,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses necessary to maintain the Army National Guard at the strength provided for in this Act."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, a member of the committee [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made a very significant observation a little while ago which I hope every Member of the House heard and appreciated. He pointed to the fact that our diplomatic problems are in considerable measure stemming from the increased military stature of the Communist world. Russia is leading from strength, and she knows our every weakness. I believe that our problems in Berlin are attributable directly to the situation which the gentleman from Missouri has described.

For a number of years we have been retrenching in certain important phases of our military organization. At the same time we have been building up in others, notably in atomic weapons and atomic capability. But because of the limited numbers of superweapons, and because of delays in their development, we do not have an all-powerful force which commands the prestige of our late World War II military organization. While we do have a very strong defense, it does not overshadow the Russian military machine as our forces did in the 1940's.

Our problem has been to provide an adequate defense without a huge increase in cost. The development and procurement of modern weapons, and even the housing and maintenance of forces costs so very much that we are hard pressed to hold any reasonable level of defense with the funds that are budgeted. Even so, the costs of defense are creeping up about a billion a year.

We had thought that our allies would build up their military organizations to supplement the deficits which occur in our own military organization as the result of concentration on the superweapons, but that has not been true.

On the other side of the Iron Curtain the Russians apparently are spending whatever funds and taking whatever steps they think are necessary to insure a strong and balanced military posture to provide the backing for vigorous diplomatic and propaganda activities.

I would like, however, to point to the fact that this is the second bill which has made a material contribution toward correcting that situation. Under the very able leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the subcommittee, our committee brought to the House last year a bill which made important strides toward better balance in our own military posture and improved strength for the free world. The bill today is a second step in the same direction, and it, too, makes extremely important contributions.

Now, these changes take time. The additional modern weapons which these bills bring to our military organization cannot be achieved overnight. They are not effective simply upon the passage of an appropriation bill. But we are moving in the right direction, and this bill is, I think, one of the best and in some fields it is the best that I have seen brought to the floor of the House.

I am pleased at some changes that the conferees have agreed to. It is important that we begin a nuclear-powered carrier. The carriers now in our fleet are getting old. They are the conventional-powered carriers which are becoming obsolete very rapidly. In order that there not be too big a gap between yesterday's carriers and tomorrow's carriers, it is important that a start be made on the nuclear carrier.

I am also very glad, Mr. Speaker, that funds have been added for Army modernization. This is one of the big weaknesses that has persisted for a number of years, and this bill makes the first significant attempt since World War II to correct that weakness.

Nothing in the bill is of greater importance than the fact that the conferees have preserved substantial funds for improvement in our posture in antisubmarine warfare measures. In view of the tremendous number of Russian submarines this undoubtedly has been the greatest single weakness in our defense program, both because of lack of emphasis and because of difficulty in making progress in this field.

I am glad to see that the conferees have insisted on keeping in the bill funds for a stepped-up missile program. Here is a weapon of today, if you please, not of tomorrow, a weapon of today against which there is no effective defense, and a weapon which Russia certainly will respect.

Mr. Speaker, it is very significant that all of this was done without exceeding the budget estimate. There is a salutary contribution, and much credit is due those who made it possible.

There is some concern as to whether the changes will be honored by the administration and the Department of Defense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, of course, the Congress cannot in most instances insure that the administration spend the money provided in this bill. But I feel the documentation which accompanies these appropriations is complete and well done and thoroughly thought out and that there is every justification for full and complete support on the part of the administration and the Department of Defense for the changes in the budget proposals which the committee recommends. All of them contribute to a stronger defense for America.

Mr. Speaker, I want to focus attention upon one particular aspect of this bill, not a costly one insofar as money goes but a very important one in our defense establishment, and that is the status of the organized Reserves. In the fiscal 1960 budget it will be noted that adequate funds are provided in the bill to provide a Reserve force of 300,000 during the fiscal year.

It is significant to me, however, that mandatory language is included in this bill which will insure a strength of 400,000 for the National Guard, and there is no such insurance for the Organized Reserves. The Senate provided mandatory language for both the Guard and the Reserves, and it is disappointing to many people that this mandatory provision for the Reserves was dropped in conference.

Now, obviously this variation could be interpreted as a lesser degree of interest on the part of the Congress in the Reserves. It could even be interpreted as an invitation for the Department of Defense to cut the Reserves to a strength of 270,000, which the Department recommended in its presentation before the committee. But certainly such a step would be contrary to the wishes of Congress, which are clearly expressed in both the House and the Senate, that a strength of 300,000 be maintained in fiscal 1960 for the Reserves.

Now, there is, of course, the possibility, in order to insure that its wishes will be carried out, that the House will instruct its conferees to accept the mandatory strength language of the Senate. Fortunately, this will not be necessary. On yesterday, at the insistence of House Members for clarification of this issue, the House Subcommittee on Defense received clear assurance from the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army that the wishes of Congress will be respected and the strength of the Reserves maintained at 300,000 during the current fiscal year as set forth in the program agreed on by the House and by the Senate. There is a printed record of the hearings which brings out this fact.

I would like to say here, Mr. Speaker, that I consider this clear understanding an important contribution toward better working relations with the Department of Defense and a recognition of the fact that Congress, too, has constitutional responsibilities for the maintenance of a proper defense.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the clarification of the position of the Reserve with respect

to the 300,000-man strength situation as just outlined by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], a distinguished member of the Army panel of the Committee on Appropriations. The amendment which is presently before the House is one which makes a slightly different arrangement for the National Guard than the conference committee proposal for the Army Reserve. I asked for this time in order that I might ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee two or three questions in this connection. I would ask, since the initial situation is currently identical between the Reserve and the National Guard, why the conference committee has adopted two different solutions for the same problem.

Mr. MAHON. I will say to the gentleman that in the bill which passed the House there were no mandatory floors for any of the services. In the other body mandatory floors were fixed for the Marines, the National Guard, and the Reserve. A majority of the House conferees took the position that the mandatory language with respect to floors could not suitably be included in an appropriation bill. As a compromise, mandatory language was approved only for the National Guard. Compromises may not in all cases be completely logical, but the logic behind our action in this case was that the National Guard is more of a State organization than is the Army Reserve. The Army Reserve is more exclusively a Federal force. It was in part on the basis of this difference in the two organizations that the agreement was reached. But, as far as I know, it was the unanimous feeling of all of the conferees that the Guard ought to be maintained at 400,000; that the Reserve should be maintained at 300,000, and that it was desirable that the Marines also be maintained at the 200,000 level which had been fixed in the Senate. The House agreed to the funds providing for the maintenance of the Marines at a strength of 200,000.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. And the chairman would agree that as the result of the House acceptance of the committee report, and of conference report it is equally the will of the Congress that the Army Reserve should be maintained at 300,000 and the Army National Guard at 400,000?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is exactly correct. There is no distinction in intent of the conferees as between the National Guard and the Reserve.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. And we have the assurance with respect to the Army Reserve that, although it is not written into this bill, it is the intention of the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense to maintain the Army Reserve at a strength of 300,000?

Mr. MAHON. We have been given that complete assurance. If that assurance had been given earlier, I think there would have been no floor on the Guard, either, and the will of the Congress would have been accomplished by that method for the fiscal year 1960.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. We have previously on occasion seen the Army's intentions overridden by the Bureau of the Budget many times. In the opinion of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on military appropriations, will the assurance that the subcommittee has received be adequate to insure that the will of Congress in this matter be assured against violation by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. MAHON. I cannot peer into the future and know for sure what may develop, but I have every confidence and I believe that the will of Congress with respect to the Guard and the Reserve will be respected.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. A further provision which has been taken out of both Senate amendment No. 7 and Senate amendment No. 8 provided for a floor under the number of 6-months trainees. This section has been taken out of both Senate amendments. Does the distinguished chairman feel that there is still a continuing pressure upon the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army to carry out the authorized program for 6-months trainees which the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard agree is essential to maintain their strengths?

Mr. MAHON. I will say to the gentleman from Montana that that is my honest belief. The language proposed by the Senate on the 6-month trainees created some difficulty with respect to whether or not it would have to be maintained at that precise level. It is my understanding that it is the intention of the Department of Defense to utilize this figure of about 55,000, more or less, depending upon the circumstances which may develop and which are not completely foreseeable.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. The funds are provided to train 55,000 6-month trainees for the National Guard and 44,000 for the Army Reserve. In implementing the congressional intent to maintain an Army Reserve of 300,000 and a National Guard of 400,000, it would appear that common sense and a desire to build effective civilian components would reinforce the moral obligation which the Pentagon now has to carry out to the full this 6-month trainee program. It is one military program that has had universal acclaim from the Army, the parents, and the trainees, and from Reserve commanders charged with building effective units.

Mr. Speaker, it is the clear will of Congress that the Army Reserve be maintained at a strength of 300,000 in paid drill status. Money has been appropriated for a Reserve of that size, and to provide an input of 44,000 6-month trainees. We now have the assurances of the Department of the Army and of the Department of Defense that the will of Congress in this matter will be respected and a 300,000-man Army Reserve will be maintained. I am satisfied that those assurances will be kept.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON] has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: On page 21, line 17, strike out "$400,000" and insert "$800,000, of which $400,000 shall not be available unless H.R. 5674 or similar authorization is enacted into law:".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: On page 30, line 9, insert ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction, maintenance, or rental of missile testing facilities until the fullest practical use is made of testing facilities and equipment at existing installations or those now under construction."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38: On page 46, line 21, insert ": *Provided*, That this amount shall be available for apportionment to the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense as determined by the Secretary of Defense."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: On page 47, line 23, insert:

"SEC. 633. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, may, whenever he deems it advantageous to the national defense to accelerate any ballistic missile program or nonballistic strategic or tactical missile programs, transfer to any appropriation for military functions under the Department of Defense available for research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement and production of ballistic missile systems or nonballistic strategic or tactical missile programs, up to 10 per centum of the amounts programed for obligation during the current fiscal year for research, development, test, and evaluation, procurement, and production or operation and maintenance of missile systems or continental air defense programs: *Provided*, That any appropriations transferred shall not exceed 10 per centum of the appropriations from which transferred: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Appropriations Committees of the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 633. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense, should he deem it

advantageous to the national defense to accelerate any strategic or tactical missile program, may transfer under the authority and terms of the Emergency Fund an additional $150,000,000 for the acceleration of such missile program or programs: *Provided,* That the transfer authority made available under the terms of the Emergency Fund appropriation contained in this Act is hereby broadened to meet the requirements of this section: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Appropriations Committees of the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this bill or participated in the discussion thereof may have permission to revise and extend their remarks; and that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

KHRUSHCHEV'S PROPOSED VISIT IS UNTIMELY

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I do not believe that there is any valid reason for us to expect anything good from this exchange of visits. If Khrushchev demonstrates his willingness to come to some reasonable agreements in Geneva, or any other place, then a summit meeting—or his meeting with President Eisenhower—may serve a constructive purpose. Until that happens, however, we are wasting time, and in addition, we may be playing right into his hands.

The agreement to exchange Eisenhower-Khrushchev visits may lull the U.S. people into a dangerous and false sense of security; it may also cause frustration and shake the morale of our allies bordering the Communist empire, of the people of Communist-dominated countries, and of the uncommitted countries.

I have always believed that an exchange of persons, under proper circumstances, can be helpful and constructive. It aids mutual understanding of each other's way of life, position, and principles.

In this instance, however, I am very sceptical about the proposed exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Nikita Khrushchev.

In the first place, I doubt that it signifies any change of heart on the part of the Communist chief, and that any good is going to come out of it.

I say this for the following reasons:

Our Secretary of State, and the Foreign Ministers of our allies, have been meeting with the Soviet representatives in Geneva for 2 months. They have not settled the issue of West Berlin, or the issue of security arrangements for Europe. The Communists have been adamant in obstructing any reasonable settlement. Further, Mr. Khrushchev himself has continued to denounce our country, and to threaten to blast us off the face of the earth.

If there was any change of heart on the part of the Communists—if they had any good will—it would have showed up in a concrete form at Geneva. There is no evidence, however, of a quid pro quo or that Communist aims and objectives have changed one iota.

My second reason is this:

Mr. Khrushchev is not going to learn, through his visit, anything about our country that he does not know already. His two right-hand men have been here recently. Both of them—Mikoyan and Kozlov—toured our country from coast to coast. Khrushchev certainly knows what they saw and learned here. He is not going to learn any more by coming here himself.

Thirdly, I am deeply concerned about the effect of Khrushchev's visit on our allies, on the uncommitted nations of the world, and on the peoples of the Communist-dominated countries.

What conclusions can they reach about his visit to the United States?

It may appear to our allies that we are going to deal with Khrushchev directly, and bypass them. This will not help to strengthen the unity of the free world. On the contrary, it can put some serious cracks in our ranks.

And what about the other peoples—the uncommitted nations, and the people of the Communist-enslaved countries? What will they think about our getting chummy with Comrade Khrushchev? I am sure that I need not say any more about their feelings.

Fourthly, we must also remember that Comrade Khrushchev has some serious problems on his hands. We did not back down in the face of his ultimatum on West Berlin. He lost some face there. The Communist massacre in Tibet has opened the eyes of some uncommitted nations, and they are becoming aware of the true aims and methods of communism. Mr. Khrushchev would undoubtedly like to divert attention from Tibet. What could be better for him than to bring his smiling face to the United States, and try to convince the world that he is really a nice, peace-loving fellow? His trip to the United States can help him save face, and lull the world into believing that Khrushchev really wants peace.

These, then, are the reasons why I am sceptical and deeply concerned about Khrushchev's proposed visit to the United States.

He has nothing to lose, and everything to win. And this exchange of visits may be playing right into his hands.

AERIAL MOBILITY OF GROUND FORCES CRITICALLY LACKING: NEW LEGISLATION WOULD SOLVE PROBLEM

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, those who insisted that the threat of massive retaliation would assure our national security, those who would place dependence on a single type of weapon, those who said the ground soldier was obsolete, no longer persuade the public mind.

The American people realize that we must be prepared to meet, and defeat, every Communist aggression, whether political subversion, economic warfare, all-out nuclear warfare or limited war, each of which has won the Soviets victories in the past. If the Communists can defeat us in any field, with any weapon, they will. There is no one-shot defense, no easy way out, no way to cut the budget and still provide for the national security. America must be able to fight and win, no matter what the time or place or weapon of the Soviet attack, in the air, or on the sea, or on the ground.

During the past year, the Congress has faced up to the fact that a limited war is much more likely than an all-out nuclear holocaust. These limited wars, or brushfire wars, require a force in being ready for combat. That is the Seventh Army in Europe, plus the so-called STRAC—Strategic Army Corps—force, and the United States Marines. These forces have the major responsibility for dealing with the limited military outbreaks. It is these men in uniform who must be able to deal with the emergencies on the ground.

How can we meet this manpower threat posed by the Communist high command? STRAC now consists of three divisions kept in the Continental United States. STRAC was formed with the idea of being ready to go anywhere on the globe in a hurry and ready to hit hard. STRAC was planned to be the Army's thunderbolt in this atomic age when the swift extinction of a small fire is just as important as the power to expand a large one until whole continents are fried to a crisp by nuclear attack. Yet STRAC does not have enough modern equipment, it does not have enough air transport, it does not have enough sea transport.

STRAC airborne troops could be ready to move within 24 hours, but with present planning and equipment it would take 17 days to airlift a single division. By that time, the Soviet divisions could have pushed through, seized their objectives and consolidated their position.

We need to make STRAC the effective force it was planned to be. We must accept the fact that the initial stages of any conflict, at any time in the

next couple of years at least, will be between ground forces. We must be prepared to equalize the present disproportion of manpower with tactical atomic weapons. We must be prepared to win a limited war.

If we are to win, we must be able to put out troops where they are needed in a hurry. I am today introducing a bill, enactment of which would go a long way toward providing "seven league boots" commensurate to the global job that faces us. Senator STROM THURMOND is joining me with introduction of identical legislation in the Senate today.

Our legislation would authorize the purchase of 200 C–130 type combat transport aircraft, manned by the Air Force Reserve, whose mission shall primarily be for the transportation of ground combat units of the Armed Forces, such as the Strategic Army Corps.

It is recognized and acknowledged by military leaders of all services that the capacity of reserve forces to participate in combat operations figures significantly in the formulation of national strategy.

The mission of the Air Force Reserve is to provide airlift capability in support of the Tactical Air Command and the Military Air Transport Service, which in addition to their commitments with respect to highly mobile tactical air strike forces, must provide the Army with the air transportation required to move troops with the utmost dispatch to any corner of the world.

There is no question but that the Air Force Reserve has been carrying out its mission with outstanding efficiency and could handle this job. Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Thomas D. White, in connection with a recent joint operation remarked that "the excellent performance of the Air Reserve Forces in this exercise confirms the fact that they are members of the first team." He was speaking of a joint Army Air Force maneuver, Dark Cloud/Pincone II, just concluded last month in North Carolina, in which the Air Force Reserve dropped thousands of members of our Army's famous 82d Airborne Division with such skill and dispatch as to earn the warmest applause and thanks of our Army and Air Force Field commanders.

Maj. Gen. Henry Viccellio, commander of TAC's 19th Air Force, made a public statement following this exercise that was very reassuring—he said: "The Air Reserve components, both Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve performed right along with the regular units of MATS and TAC with the same efficiency and competence as the regulars." General Viccellio should know what he is talking about. Last year in the Lebanon crisis he was commander of all Air Force units that were utilized in that operation.

It is notable that the stature of the Reserve components with respect to the active establishment has been attained in spite of the fact that they are equipped with obsolete aircraft of restricted range and limited capacity. In effect, the Reserves are operating in the strategic environment of the nuclear age while using aircraft designed for the concepts of World War II.

Let me cite a few comparative figures both with respect to cost and capability to demonstrate what can be accomplished by providing these Reserve units with the kind of equipment they deserve—air transport similar to or better than the C–130.

The C–119 now in use has a capacity of 42 troops, or 10,000 pounds of cargo, and a materially restrictive range of approximately 1,000 miles. The C–130 mentioned can accomodate 96 troops with full field equipment, or 35,000 pounds of cargo. The inherent range of the C–130 is 3,200 miles, and this can be extended to global capability by the use of aerial refueling—a feature, incidentally, which is not included in the design of the C–119. The C–130 is the aircraft which enabled the Air Force and the Army to resolve the crisis in Lebanon last year by snuffing the spark of brush-fire war before it could burst into flame.

The C–130 combat cargo is a larger and therefore more expensive aircraft, but the figures show that for an operating cost of about one-third more per wing, the yield in usable, practical airlift is well above double.

Furthermore, military experience of recent years has demonstrated that Reserve elements are capable of responding to emergency requirements with a reaction time comparable to that of units in the active establishment. Obviously, then, their value in event of national emergency closely approaches that of active components. But the cost of maintaining a Reserve wing of C–130 or similar aircraft—fully manned, equipped, and ready for utilization—is about $8 million per year less. Is this not a factor worthy of our consideration since the combat effectiveness has been established?

There are more than 37,800 pilots and 17,300 navigators and other rated officers enrolled on the rosters of the Air Force Reserve. Here is a giant pool of aviation skill and experience which can be exploited in building the bulwark of strength which we agree is needed. These men are capable. It is our duty to provide them with the tools they need to fulfill their mission.

In summation, I should like to reestablish these main points.

The acquisition of 200 C–130 or similar combat cargo planes in the hands of the Air Force Reserve will:

First. Satisfy the Army and Marine requirement for airlift for a local or general war without jeopardizing the limited in-being capability of the Active Air Force;

Second. Provide needed postwar airlift of occupation forces and equipment;

Third. Provide a global, high-speed airplane that can accommodate a large missile or a light tank;

Fourth. Reduce maintenance costs per ton-mile over the obsolete World War II C–119; and

Fifth. Better utilize the thousands of trained Reserve air crew personnel now on our rosters.

A SOUND DOLLAR IS THE BASIS FOR FUTURE GROWTH AND SECURITY OF THE NATION

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a companion House concurrent resolution identical to the Resolution 367 introduced on July 30 by my colleague, the Honorable GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, which provides as follows:

Whereas the Constitution delegates solely to the Congress the power and duty to lay and collect taxes, pay the debts of the Nation, and borrow money on the credit of the United States; and

Whereas the continued appropriation of more money from the Treasury than is received by it is a primary cause of inflation; and

Whereas inflation robs the worker of his wage increase, the businessman of a just return on his investment, and the retired person of his savings; and

Whereas inflation discourages thrift and saving by lessening the value of money saved and thus is contrary to the traditional American way of saving for emergencies and future needs; and

Whereas inflation causes concern in foreign countries as to the stability of the American dollar, thus causing an adverse effect on this Nation's position in the world markets: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that a sound dollar is the basis for future growth and security of the Nation, its people, its industries and businesses, and its governments, and that in order to maintain a sound dollar it must be the duty and obligation of the Congress—

(a) to conduct its business so that income will exceed outgo from the Treasury except in time of war or other grave national emergency;

(b) to provide for systematic payments on the outstanding financial obligations of the Nation to reduce the present interest cost of the national debt and its burden on future generations; and

(c) to use every available means to reduce the rates and types of taxation on individuals and businesses in order to stimulate the growth of the economy and protect the security of the Nation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the time is far past due for Congress to stop spending more than the revenues collected by our U.S. Treasury from our already overburdened American taxpayers.

Every informed American citizen knows that, unless the reckless spending spree is stopped effectively that private as well as Federal bankruptcy will surely befall us.

I sincerely hope and pray that this resolution will be adopted before this session of Congress adjourns. We dare not do less or suffer the consequences.

THE LATE LYDIA LANGER

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the death of Lydia Langer. Lydia Langer was the wife of our distinguished senior Senator from the State of North Dakota.

I have known Mr. and Mrs. Langer for over the past 30 years. In fact, I was associated politically with Mr. LANGER for a great number of years. This loss will be felt by thousands of our citizens in North Dakota and outside of North Dakota.

Mrs. Langer had a unique career in her own right. At one time she was a candidate for Governor of North Dakota when her husband, because of legal obstacles, was unable to run. She stood constantly by his side all during his public life and his private life. She was a devoted wife and loving mother. She leaves four fine daughters. My sincere sympathy goes to the Senator and his four daughters.

THE DEATH OF MRS. LANGER

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it is not with surprise, but with a feeling of deep regret that I just received word of the death of Mrs. Lydia Langer, the wife of North Dakota's distinguished senior Senator. All of us in North Dakota have been aware for many months that Mrs. Langer was suffering from an incurable disease, and her passing was accepted as inevitable. She has made a valiant fight and from time to time it appeared that the cancer that afflicted her was being thwarted. Fate has decreed otherwise, however, and today we learn that death has taken one of North Dakota's finest ladies.

Mrs. Langer occupied an unusual place in the esteem of the people of North Dakota. While our senior Senator has been a rather controversial figure in the public eye his wife never shared any of the opposition accorded our senior Senator. Whether or not people agreed with BILL LANGER, his wife always was held in the highest possible regard and very justifiably so, in my opinion. She was a fine lady in every possible application of that term.

Words are completely inadequate to comfort a husband and family at the time of the loss of a wife and mother.

I am sure that I reflect the sentiment of every person in my State when I express my sympathy to Senator LANGER and the members of the Langer family.

THE TRIVIA ON TELEVISION: EITHER VAPID OR VIOLENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the television networks do not realize the great possibilities of the medium at their command.

Maybe they in turn are the slaves of the sponsors and their advertising agencies.

In any case, the content of television programs leaves very much to be desired. The murder, mayhem, pathos, slapstick, and talking singers are keyed to the lowest common denominator in the viewing public. It is not so much that the programers seem to consider all of us as children, irrespective of age, that irritates us as much as the fact that they cater to our inclination toward juvenile delinquency that we outgrew years and decades ago.

When is television going to provide us with the wholesome and happy entertainment, and the human dramas that do not depend upon a gun or a handkerchief for a solution?

More and more Americans are disturbed by the failure of television to develop its true potentialities.

As an example of that mounting criticism, I recommend for your consideration the following forthright editorial titled "Togetherness," from the August 2 issue of the Lawrence Sunday Sun, published in Lawrence, Mass.:

TOGETHERNESS

There's a word that's beginning to grind on our nerves. It's that increasingly used and increasingly trite "togetherness."

Supposedly, it is descriptive of a cozy condition involving a family or other group in which everyone has the same objectives. That's all very well and good. We like the idea of affinity so long as it is on the proper side of the social ledger.

Togetherness has a variety of applications. In one sense, it has a most acceptable definition when it pertains to the family. It also is pertinent to community effort for the public weal.

But when you apply togetherness to industries like television, you encounter a maze of conflict.

Not of late, but for years, there has been a relentless bombardment of television programs which are anything but contributory to the welding of that tight little knot known as the family group.

There is too much glorification of crime and criminals on television. The so-called "dramatic" programs inevitably reach a climax in which the baddie gets his just desserts. But in the denouement of the story there is altogether too much instruction beamed at youth in how crimes are planned and perpetrated—no matter what the outcome might be in the last few seconds of the story.

Some of the westerns are bad enough, both in acting and plot. But the detective stories could bear a bit of cleaning up—if not in the acting division then in the mechanics of presenting a script in which the baddie is a hero until he is unmasked, disgraced and punished.

The principal audience for these crime stories is made of adolescents. Mom and Dad usually go for the song-and-dance type of entertainment, or for the tear-jerking soap operas. But to what is classed as impressionable youth, the crime yarns have the greater appeal.

What is particularly disturbing in the situation is that there does not appear to be any way of stopping pictorial descriptions of such things as Chicago infamous St. Valentine's Day massacre and other stories whether historic or imaginary, which glorify brutality.

Can you think of one evening that has gone by without some "private eye" being beaten up, gun-whipped, ambushed or otherwise shot and lacerated on your TV screen. This is fun? This is stuff for adolescents, for children, to see by the hour? Is it fun to expose them to lessons in the fine art of mayhem and slaughter?

The answer to criticism would be that "the public goes for it—look at our Hooper rating."

Who in hell—if you will pardon the expression—is Hooper? Is he, or she, or an agency under that name, the guardian of the mentality and morals of your children?

Has any Hooper or any other person ever called you to inquire whether you are watching a certain program in your home? The answer in millions of cases would be, naturally, "no." Then what hold does Hooper have on the television industry?

There must be some means by which all of us can be restored to some position of normalcy in the television field. There is a lot of complaint about the advertising. It's a necessary evil. Giving credit where credit is due, we have never seen Josephine Hennessey take a drink of the alcoholic beverage she extolls between innings of a ball game. Were it not for sponsors who pay the bills for the broadcasts there would be few of our favorite programs on our living-room screens.

But it's time we let sponsors know that we are tired of the endless blood-letting and killing that goes on, for hours on end, in these TV programs.

Somewhere, somehow, they can find writers who can whip up a spanking new technique which will give us—and our children—something of a vacation from the endless grind of battle, murder, and sudden death which causes our homes to sound like a Coney Island shooting gallery every day of the week—Sunday included.

We can thank goodness for baseball and football for lifting the pressure during their proper seasons. The rest of the time is what bothers us.

And those repeat programs. Would you sit down and read the same book twice, thrice, or four times in a year? Would you bother with your newspaper or magazine if it repeated its stories, edition after edition? Television is basically a good medium of entertainment. Let's stick with the base.

PUBLICITY DECISIVE?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recent publicity given by the press, TV, and radio to the reprehensible, illegal practices carried on by Reuther, Beck, Hoffa, and a few other professional, criminal, labor leaders has finally forced Congress to consideration of remedial legislation.

Mail now indicates that politicians whose fetish is political expediency will be forced to decide that it is politically advantageous to join the parade of the comparative few who, ever since the sit-down strikes of 1937, have been trying to give notice that the political and economic dictatorship sought by a few unscrupulous and ambitious individuals was making rapid progress toward the overthrow of our accepted economic gov-

ernmental processes. It is time to stop, look, and act.

Because labor—employees—has consistently been regarded as having less opportunity and wealth resources than those who provided jobs, labor has had the sympathy and support of legislators.

The McClellan and other congressional committees, and a few Members of Congress who have complained for years, have finally focused public attention upon abuses practiced by a few labor organizations which have been controlled and directed by individuals referred to above.

There are now in the legislative hopper many bills seeking a remedy.

The House Committee on Education and Labor reported out a weakened Kennedy-Ervin bill. Republicans on that committee, as well as three or four Democrats, sought a more comprehensive and stronger bill, but they did not, in committee, for political reasons, offer a substitute.

Later, one or two Democrats and a Republican or two secretly joined in asking legislative experts to put together a substitute bill. The result was the Landrum-Griffin bill, in the main a collection of excerpts from bills previously introduced, which was more stringent and tougher, more effective than the Elliott—formerly the Kennedy-Ervin—bill. The substitute provisions were carefully concealed from committee members and the public. Why?

The substitute carried many of the provisions of bills introduced by me years ago, but which were refused consideration by the leadership of the House, both Republican and Democrat, because it was then said they were anti-labor—a misnomer.

The substitute does not contain any provision designed to prevent monopolistic practices by unions as they are by industry. It does not prevent the closed shop where a would-be employee must pay tribute in order to earn a livelihood. It does not carry any provision similar to a Michigan statute—the Hutchinson Act—which would bar strikes against public utilities which furnish us with the necessities of life, and where an effective strike would be a complete blackout—prevent the furnishing of transportation, light, water, and power.

The foregoing is stated because this last week, due to the publicity just mentioned, which has undoubtedly made the average citizen cognizant of what has happened, many letters have come to me asking that I support the substitute bill—the writers evidently having forgotten that for more than 20 years I have been advocating—perhaps too often—every good feature it contains.

Twenty-two years and four months ago, April 5, 1937, a bill containing many of the provisions of the bill I am now asked to support was introduced by me. An amended bill, more fully defining the term "affecting commerce," was introduced on April 15, 1937.

I can only answer that I am anxious and pleased to support similar remedial legislation, to express appreciation to the publicity agencies which have brought about the changed attitude of the public, and to hope that the professional politicians and office-seekers, whose efforts I am glad to stand on the sidelines and cheer, will not have a change of mind before effective legislation is on the books.

It is also my prayerful hope that, when on the books, officers charged with the enforcement of the law—and I am thinking of the Department of Justice—will then enthusiastically and effectively enforce that legislation; that home folks will support local officers who enforce the law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

MORTGAGE RELIEF IN DISTRESSED AREAS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4796 which I introduced on February 19 of this year sets forth a formula to provide much-needed temporary relief from the pressure of FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages in distress cases where extraordinary circumstances prevail. It accomplishes this by permitting a 1-year moratorium on such mortgages, with the Federal Government assuming the required mortgage payments—both principal and interest—for mortgagors. Such relief would apply only to individuals in economically depressed areas who are unemployed and unable to make payments through no fault of their own.

Millions more of our people today own homes than ever before. The strides which have been made in the field of home financing are a tribute to the administrative efficiency and dedicated work of the Federal agencies concerned with this program, as well as our private institutions.

Even while recognizing this excellent record, I think it is essential that we also keep in mind the fact that these Federal agencies work under a mandate laid down by the very legislative processes with which we are dealing at this moment. Thus it is that when we find a law too unyielding and harsh in its lack of flexibility for dealing with situations that involve human problems, it is the responsibility of Congress to correct such inequities. It is for the express intent of avoiding foreclosure of a temporarily unemployed individual's mortgage by any of our Federal mortgage agencies—assuming that the individual is unemployed through no fault of his own and is a resident of an economically depressed area—that I have introduced this bill.

This bill spells out the term "economically depressed area" on any given date to mean an industrial area in which there has existed unemployment of not less than (A) 15 percent of the labor force during the 6-month period immediately preceding such date, if the principal causes of such unemployment are determined not to be temporary in nature; or (B) 12 percent of the labor force during the 12-month period immediately preceding such date; or (C) 9 percent of the labor force during at least 15-months of the 18-month period immediately preceding such date; or (D) 6 percent of the labor force during at least 18 months of the 24-month period immediately preceding such date.

The bill further specifies that determinations of the duration and amount of unemployment, in a given industrial area shall be made by the Secretary of Labor and certified to the Federal mortgage agencies not less often than quarterly. The Secretary of Labor may also certify to such agencies, as an economically depressed area, any industrial area within the United States—even though it does not meet the requirements I have just described in my preceding remarks—which is determined by him to be an area in which there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time.

H.R. 4796 defines the term "unemployed mortgagor" to mean "any individual who is a mortgagor under a mortgage securing a loan, if the appropriate Federal mortgage agency determines that such loan is—or is likely to be—in default because such individual, although willing and able to work, is unemployed through no fault of his own."

I want to underscore the fact that this bill provides a moratorium on payments for just 1 year. Said moratorium may be terminated earlier on a date on which the mortgagor ceases to be unemployed, or on a date on which the mortgagor becomes in default or with respect to a condition or covenant other than that required for payment of installments of principal and interest in specified amounts and at stated times. After any individual is permitted a 1-year moratorium, a Federal mortgage agency may not again assume or suspend the obligation of such individual under any other mortgage. In other words, relief may be obtained by any individual for just one time and is limited to 1 year. It should also be noted that the mortgagor is ultimately required to repay the obligation after the regular maturity date of the mortgage.

Mr. Speaker, this is a measure that is humanitarian in purpose. There are certain economically depressed areas in our Nation—fortunately they are few—in which reside unemployed individuals who through no fault of their own are unemployed and unable to make payments on mortgages insured under the National Housing Act or secured by home loan agreement under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code. It should be evident that relief for just 1 year from the pressure of mortgage payments is a tender of help to a man with a family at a time when he needs that kind of help the most.

There have been some unhappy examples of mortgage foreclosures in economically depressed areas which should and could have been averted had there been legislation providing for a procedure such as my bill proposes to establish. My own district has witnessed some of these occurrences, in which the Federal mortgage agency brought foreclosure action in line with the literal and legal requirements of the law.

Because of my concern with respect to this problem, you may recall that I

proposed an amendment to S. 57 on this floor on May 20, when the housing bill was being debated. That amendment, by and large, would have accomplished a similar purpose so far as foreclosures on FHA mortgages were involved.

Events since that time have demonstrated the continuing importance of having such a provision inserted into our existing laws covering the Federal Government's underwriting of mortgages, not only by the FHA, but also by the Veterans' Administration.

This bill is not a handout; it is not a form of charity. Rather, it is a simple, uncomplicated, and humane remedy that can be accepted with dignity by the individual whom it is designed to aid.

Mr. Speaker, I call this matter to the attention of my colleagues at this time in the hope that something will be done before this session of the 86th Congress adjourns. There is still talk and rumor about further action on either the vetoed S. 57 or a new housing bill. Should the latter be decided upon and a new bill on housing come before us this session, I sincerely hope that the provisions of my bill will be incorporated therein for the FHA mortgages, or, failing that, I hope that affirmative action on my bill can be obtained in some other manner.

FEIGHAN DEMANDS NIXON REVEAL HIS TALKS WITH KHRUSHCHEV ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN Mr. Speaker, the resolution declaring Captive Nations Week unanimously passed both Houses of Congress.

No single act of Congress has commanded so much national and international attention in years. No single action by the Eisenhower administration has won as much acclaim or brought so much credit to our country as that which attaches to the proclamation which the President issued in response to the congressional resolution. In these results there is a lesson, indeed a startling lesson, in the power of human ideals and the rewards that can be ours as a Nation if we remain true to our political ideals and fearless in their propagation.

It was in very large measure coincidental that the passage of this resolution by the Congress, and the proclamation by the President, coincided with the visit of Vice President NIXON to Moscow to open the U.S. exhibition there. But it was a happy coincidence. It was happy because it gave real purpose to the Vice President's trip, it served notice on the Russian leaders that we, the people of the United States, would never substitute cultural exchanges—particularly those like the Kozlov-Nixon exchanges—trade fairs and exhibitions, or international cocktail parties for our political ideals. It reaffirmed our confidence in the popular will of the people of the captive nations as a certain instrument through which they will regain their freedom and national independence. It served notice that the American people will not stand for any deal, no matter how attractive propaganda may paint it to be, with the advocates of tyranny, despotism, and the dismal peace of human slavery. This is the vital message Khrushchev and company received through this action by Congress, the President concurring.

The first reaction of the Russian spokesman, Khrushchev, made upon his return to Moscow from an excursion into Communist occupied Poland, provides abundant evidence that the captive nations resolution broke up a clambake that had been prepared for the Vice President. Attacking the resolution, Khrushchev said:

> They send their Governors here—

Referring to the recent visit of nine U.S. Governors—

> They send their Vice President here. They are opening an exhibit here—and then do a thing like this.

From this it is clear that the Russians believed that we were willing to trade our political ideals for a mess of pottage of nonessentials. It is also clear that by our lack of political action during the past several years we have allowed the Russians to deceive themselves into believing that we would be willing to turn our backs on the captive nations if they would go through the motions of appearing somewhat reformed after the death of Stalin. What a tragedy it would have been if the Vice President had walked into the well-prepared Russian political clambake with his hosts laboring under this serious miscalculation. The consequences would have been far reaching and the results disastrous for the cause of human freedom. I say this because the massive propaganda machine of the Russians would have carried these miscalculations, now so apparent, to a point where it would be most difficult, if not impossible, for our country to extract itself from the trap.

So it is that the captive nations resolutions set the proper stage for the talks between the Vice President and Khrushchev. I refer of course to the private, off the record talks which took place after the scene at the Moscow exhibit. The people of the United States will await with interest a report by the Vice President as to what he told Khrushchev in private about United States intention toward the captive nations. We can be certain that this was one of the main points of discussion because Khrushchev has practically talked about nothing else since the arrival of the Vice President in Moscow. Khrushchev has been denouncing the purpose of the resolution and it will be of continuing public interest to hear from the Vice President what he said to Khrushchev on this score in their private chats. In this connection I should like to note that the Vice President has made no public statements on this basic issue up to this point of his tour of the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic.

A number of erroneous statements have been made concerning the itinerary of the Vice President which I feel should be corrected. In the first place he did not tour the Soviet Union as widely reported in the American press. His tour was restricted to one nation of the Soviet Union—the Russian nation, and then he saw only carefully selected parts of this nation. To create the false impression that Mr. NIXON was on a visit of the Soviet Union is to put his trip all out of proportion to the facts, a situation which might prove embarrassing to our country at a later date. For example, the Russians could claim that they opened the doors to the Soviet Union for the Vice President—which they have not done.

It is a sad situation that the itinerary of the Vice President did not include visits to the captive nations of the Soviet Union, all of those enumerated in the congressional resolution. I speak of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, White Ruthenia—Byelorussia—Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, North Caucasia, Turkestan, Cossackia, and Idel-Ural. No one can honestly claim to have visited the Soviet Union without including these captive nations on his itinerary. I realize the Russians would find many reasons for blocking a visit to these nations by the Vice President. However, Mr. NIXON could have properly challenged Khrushchev to go with him on a visit to these Russian occupied countries and there ask the people "Are you captives?" Since Khrushchev first raised the question among the Russians and got the answer he sought, it would have been an act of political wisdom for Mr. NIXON to challenge him to raise the same question among the people of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. After all, they are the majority people of the Soviet Union, not the Russians, and their voice should have been heard on this critical issue.

But then Mr. NIXON may not have been properly briefed on the realities of the Soviet Union before he left. A report of his visit carried in the Wall Street Journal of July 27 indicates that he does not have an accurate picture of the Soviet Union or its people. The Journal reported that while the Vice President was campaigning in Moscow he came across a pretty girl and learned that she was Ukrainian. He promptly proclaimed to the crowd around him, "Look at this pretty Ukrainian girl. Ukraine is the Texas of the Soviet Union." The only similarity between the Ukraine and the State of Texas is that the people of both love liberty and are prepared to fight for it. There the similarity ends. There is no other major similarity between the Ukrainian nation and the great State of Texas. Texas is a voluntary political unit of the United States, whereas Ukraine is not a voluntary unit of the Soviet Union—having been forcibly incorporated therein against the will of the people. Texas is self-governing, electing its officials in free and unfettered elections whereas Ukraine does not enjoy self-government and all officials there are handpicked by the Russian Communists in Russian style elections. Texas has a voice, and I might say a powerful voice, in the Congress and in our Government whereas Ukraine has no voice in the Presidium of the Soviet Union, other than the "parrots" selected by the Russians and even

these stooges are allowed nothing more than the opportunity to acclaim whatever Khrushchev and the Russian crowd have decided in advance. The people of Texas speak English, the common language of our country, the people of the Ukraine speak Ukrainian which is not the common language of the Soviet Union because the Soviet Union is a multinational and multilingual empire. Texas has never been engaged in a state of war against the Federal Government since joining the Union, whereas the people of Ukraine have been engaged in a constant war against the Russian Communists for the past 40-odd years. I have heard no reports of the people of Texas desiring to withdraw from the Union, whereas the people of Ukraine have been attempting to do just that since they were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union. Perhaps the Vice President should make a get-acquainted visit to Texas after his return home or hire a better teacher than he had to prepare him for his visit to the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic.

We can be sure that the organs of Russian propaganda will give full treatment to Mr. NIXON's unfortunate remarks about the Ukraine. The effect of his words is to say to the Ukrainians, "We Americans consider you a voluntary and happy part of the Soviet Union and we hope it stays that way forever." Khrushchev and company will take full advantage of this unfortunate quip by Mr. NIXON to offset the favorable impact on public opinion in the Ukraine developed by the captive nations resolution.

Another reaction by Khrushchev to the resolution was his complaint that its passage was unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of other nations. He has been blasting away at this thesis for the past several days. This reaction is reminiscent of a similar protest made by Czar Nicholas in 1905 to a resolution passed by the French Parliament. At that time the first signs of revolution were showing in the Russian Empire; the people were fed up with the despotic and psychotic rulers of the empire and were engaged in a revolt. The French Parliament passed a resolution expressing sympathy for Poland which was then enslaved by the Russians. Czar Nicholas delivered a protest at the French Government, demanding that the French Government stay out of the internal affairs of the Russian Empire. Of course, the French ignored the czar and the tempo of the revolutionary spirit increased within the Russian Empire until it collapsed in 1917 under the pressure of the non-Russian nations in their struggles for their national independence. The Russian Communists have been engaged in wars of aggression for the past 40 years in an effort to restore the old empire. Khrushchev as the new czar has adopted all the traditions of the old czarist regime, including his latest attacks on the captive nations resolution.

But there are positive values and results already apparent from this action by the Congress and the President. Speaking in Ukraine on July 30, Khrushchev had this to say about the Berlin crisis, something entirely new I might add:

> If the people of West Berlin wish to live under capitalism, let them. It is their own domestic matter. We do not intend to interfere.

What a change this is from the belligerent statements of this same character when he caused the Berlin crisis and when he attempted to frighten our allies with the threat of nuclear war unless all of Berlin was handed over to Communist control. It is no coincidence that Khrushchev makes this new proposition on the basis that he would not interfere in the internal affairs of West Berlin. His overriding fear is that we will keep the political initiative which we have won through the captive nations resolution and that pressing our cause for a just peace we will hasten the collapse of the modern day Russian Empire. Thus, he is prepared to pay a price—he will not interfere in the affairs of West Berlin if we will cease and desist in our support of the captive nations. This is the quid pro quo Khrushchev now seeks from us. A mutual pact of noninterference is his objective.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman on the able speech he is making, a very analytical speech and a very timely speech.

The passage about 2 weeks ago by the Congress of the Captive Nations Week concurrent resolution, which I had the pleasure of offering in the House, and which passed both branches by a unanimous vote, has brought about tremendous favorable reaction in the free world.

As news of the passage of this resolution has been conveyed to the peoples of satellite nations, its passage has brought to tens of millions of persons in Communist-dominated countries, and who despise Communism, intensified hope.

The best evidence that the Kremlin realizes the significance of our action is shown by the violent utterances of Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union. The passage of the resolution penetrated deeply the Communist world because Khrushchev and his associates in the world conspiracy know that in Europe alone over 100 million dominated persons despise them and their vicious ideology.

Khrushchev and his associates know these persons are a very weak link in Communist control of those countries, and thereby a powerful reserve and asset we have in case the Soviet Union should undertake to hurl a general war upon mankind.

They know in case of war, at least 100 million persons in Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, and other dominated countries, will rise against the Muscovites, and engage in armed resistance, sabotage, and other acts.

That is what you mean by the "Russians"—you mean Moscovites.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, indeed; and I would add another 100 million people in the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union itself who will rise against the Moscovites.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. And as I say, at least a hundred million people will rise against the Moscovites and engage in armed resistance, sabotage, and other acts.

And this is one of the strongest assets our country, Great Britain, and France have in any negotiations—if this is stressed in a firm and united manner.

And under no conditions should we enter into any agreement which would in effect constitute selling these people down the river.

For while we cannot now actively capitalize their hatred of communism and the Communists, in case of a general conflict, we could do so effectively.

And the Communist leaders, particularly the military, know that fact.

The screeching of pain by the Communist leaders is evidence of this fact.

Deputy Soviet Prime Minister Kozlov, when he was recently in the United States, had the arrogance to state those governments, Communist regimes, were freely chosen by the people of dominated European countries.

Pravda states the same falsehood.

The resolution we passed challenges the Soviet Union to permit the peoples of those countries to determine what form of government they want, in a free manner, with a secret ballot, and internationally supervised, or supervised by the United Nations.

The Soviet Union would not dare let this happen. Khrushchev and his associates well know that in a free determination of their form of government, the people of those countries would overwhelmingly repudiate, reject and denounce communism.

The resolution the Congress passed was timely. It puts the Soviet Union on the defensive. Our country, France, Great Britain, West Germany, Italy, and other free nations should follow it through by constantly reminding the Kremlin of its broken promises, and by constantly putting on any agenda of negotiations the questions of free elections to determine their own form of government of dominated nations.

The passage of the resolution has strengthened and intensified the hope of over 100 millions of persons for liberty and freedom.

We have hit the Kremlin where it is the weakest.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I congratulate the distinguished majority leader who is one of the outstanding leaders and fighters in the cause of social justice, individual liberty, human freedom, and national independence. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the excellent analysis that you have made of the present situation with reference to the captive nations and the resolution we passed regarding them.

There may well come the time when there will be a spontaneous revolt by all the non-Russian captive nations which the Russians will be unable to put down. The revolts in East Germany in 1953,

also in Poznan, Poland, and the Hungarian revolution in October 1956, are instances of separate revolts. If all the captive nations would revolt spontaneously at the same time, the Russians would not be able to keep all of them from attaining their freedom and national independence, which they previously enjoyed before the illegal occupation and takeover by the Russians. This would be doubly true in the event of war.

There is no need for us to pay any price to the Russians for justice in the world order if we remain loyal to our political ideals and vigorous in our propagation of them. The harder we press our current initiative won in the cold war by the Captive Nations Week resolution, the more ground the Russians will be compelled to give up. They have no alternative. They face internal revolution on a scale that will make the revolution of 1917 seem like a Sunday picnic and they know it. We should take new confidence in the power of our political ideals as a deterrent to war and as an instrument in the prosecution of a just and lasting peace for all nations and all men.

I look forward with interest to the return of the Vice President to the United States and his report to the people on his visit to one of the nations of the Soviet Union. No public report will be complete or acceptable by the American people unless he sets the record straight as to the position he took on the Captive Nations Week resolution in his private chats with Khrushchev. To deny that this was the main issue of the conversation would be an affront to the intelligence of the American people. To claim that his conversation on this issue must remain confidential would deprive the American people of information they are entitled to have and to judge on its merits. To withhold a frank and complete report on what he and Khrushchev had to say on this issue will place a dark cloud of doubt over Mr. NIXON's trip and give rise to grave questions about the purpose of the Vice President's visit in the first place.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. MONAGAN. I joined with the majority leader at the time this resolution first came up on the floor of the House, and I certainly see no reason at this time so far as I am concerned to have any different opinion now than I had then. It seems to me that the resolution was based on realities and that it represented our philosophy, our national philosophy, toward these captive nations. I do not believe for a moment that the fact that we passed a resolution here in the House of Representatives would have any substantial effect on the policies of the Communist leadership toward these countries. I wonder if the gentleman would not agree with that?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I disagree. The purpose of the resolution was not to try to change the beliefs of the Russian leaders, because as realists we ought to recognize that we cannot change the thinking of the leaders of the Communist conspiracy. It would be ludicrous and ridiculous to think we can change the minds of Khrushchev and the leaders of the Russian Communist conspiracy. The purpose of the resolution was to serve notice on the world that we are in the camp of the anti-imperialists and that we look forward to an era of self-government and national independence for all the countries of the world. This is the positive message of the Captive Nations Week resolution to all the people of the world. The resolution reassures the Russians that we will not relax our efforts to bring freedom and national independence to the nations suffering under the yoke of Russian Communist slavery. The resolution was a challenge to the Russians to permit free elections in the captive non-Russian nations to enable them to determine their own destiny as nations.

The Russians illegally occupy and control not only the non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union itself, but also other non-Russian nations of Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Poland, East Germany, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Tibet.

The Russians should realize that we are persistent in our determination to bring liberation to these captive nations. Because of our resolution the leaders in the Kremlin will not only be hesitant, they will be fearful of starting a war because they will be afraid of uprisings by the captive people.

Mr. MONAGAN. If the gentleman will yield further, it seems to me, too, that when during the NIXON visit Khrushchev was talking to him in the parks and cities about the captive nations and captive people he was pointing out to him Russian people. They saw no non-Russians at any time, no people of Hungary, Poland, or some of these other nations. It seems to me that the omission was very significant.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I certainly agree with the gentleman on that. I said earlier in my remarks that it would have been a part of political wisdom for Mr. NIXON to go with Khrushchev beyond the nation of Russia and go to these other non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union that were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union where they would not all be stooges as were those to whom Khrushchev addressed his remarks when he asked them: "Are you captive?"

Mr. Speaker, by unanimously passing the Captive Nations Week resolution, Congress has expressed its firm determination to stand behind the campaign promises of President Eisenhower in his 1952 campaign and his 1956 election campaign when he declared:

> The peaceful liberation of captive peoples has been, is, and—until success is achieved—will continue to be a goal of U.S. foreign policy.

I include in my remarks the Captive Nations Week resolution, which reads as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE THIRD WEEK OF JULY AS "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK"

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations, look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

DISTINGUISHED TEACHERS FROM IRELAND—VISIT OF IRISH TEACHERS, LED BY A DYNAMIC YOUNG IRISH TEACHER, MR. STEPHEN DALY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there came to the Capitol 15 Irish teachers who are visit-

ing the United States as guests of the Department of State and the U.S. Office of Education to learn more about American schools and America. They came to the Capitol as my guests. They watched the proceedings of the House for some time and said they were much impressed with our legislative procedures. Our distinguished leaders came to see them while they were here. Our beloved Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, the beloved former Speaker, Mr. MARTIN, the distinguished floor leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. BOLAND of the Appropriations Committee, Mrs. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, and others made fine talks to them.

For almost 10 years I have asked for recognition of the Irish teachers in the various U.S. cultural exchange programs. To me the rich cultural heritage of the Irish, coupled with an appreciation of their zealous devotion to freedom has made me feel that there is a spiritual tie as well as a personal tie between the Irish people and our own. We love their Tom Moore, we love the early legends, the music and the drama of the Irish, and we do appreciate that in every line of poetry, in every note of music, in every line of drama, there is written a deep appreciation of beauty, even in gray sky, of hope in adversity, of faith in a closeness to God. We need the close tie with these people because we share each other's devotion to freedom. We admire the deep courage and loyalty of the Irish people.

The teachers who came decided to come to the United States for a vacation and to study our schools, as well as various other activities in this country. They paid their own expenses, and they have been the guests of the State Department and of the U.S. Office of Education since they arrived.

They were a most delightful group, all handsome, intelligent young men and women. It was a joy to have known them.

We plan to have a group of teachers from the United States study in Ireland and have more Irish teachers come here and study with us.

I will give later a list of the names and the teachers who came here, they may have distint relatives and friends in this country. And my colleagues may have friends or relatives in Ireland that they want to send messages to. I hope that every Member of Congress will meet them while they are here. They will be here for about a week.

May God give them a safe return to their country and a happy experience with us and the hope they will come back to us.

YEGHIA JUKNAVORIAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to read part of a letter from the U.S. Attorney for the District of Massachusetts regarding a man named Yeghia Juknavorian who died recently, making the Treasury of the United States the beneficiary to the extent of $500 under his life insurance policy. The reasons for his doing this are set out in a handwritten document which he turned over to his attorney in 1954, and I shall simply read part of it, as follows:

I came to this country in 1910. At that time I was dreaming myself. I thought I had died in Turkey and I find myself dragged into heaven—that was my idea of the United States; in 1927, I brought my wife and my daughter from Marseilles, France, but I cannot bring in my son because he was a couple of weeks over 18 years. Then in 1928 my wife got sick. She was operated on and caught pneumonia. Every time I went to the hospital she called for our son "Come on Mike," "Come on Michael," and the next day I went to see Mrs. ROGERS. I told her the story. Mrs. ROGERS told me "I am very sorry but we cannot break the law. He is over 18 years of age. But we will try to bring him here for a 6-month vacation." I said that I was very appreciative. She told me between 3 or 4 days after "I have to go to Washington. Then I am going to telegraph to the American Ambassador in France to allow your son to come for a 6-month vacation." About 3 weeks after that time my son came out here and saw his mother alive. This is worth a million dollars, what Mrs. ROGERS has done. Now thanks to God, I have seven grandchildren—four boys and three girls. One boy is now in Korea, another one enlisted 2 months ago, the other two, 15 and 6 years old. Now this Government doing all this, help the people, save the people.

Mr. Speaker, this is a wonderful letter of appreciation of the United States, together with a gift of $500 to help keep our country strong and free.

IMPORTANCE OF EXCHANGE VISITS AT EVERY LEVEL

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to voice my complete approval of the decision made by President Eisenhower to exchange visits with the head of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev. I am a firm believer in the importance of exchanges at every level. The difficult and vital problems which have confronted the United States and the other free nations of the world in dealing with the Soviet Union can only be resolved by the exploration of every possible avenue of negotiation. Our foreign policy must unceasingly be directed toward the establishment of areas of agreement and understanding between leaders of the Soviet Union and our leaders. The arrangements made for the visit of Premier Khrushchev and the return visit of President Eisenhower may possibly prove to be important preliminaries to such agreements. There are many matters as to which Premier Khrushchev is misinformed, or about which he does not want to be properly informed. Let us hope his visit here will open his eyes to our way of life, and our goals. Such an exchange as is proposed by the President can do no harm, and may do some good.

We must make it clear, of course, that the United States contemplates no retreat from its firm opposition to the ruthless expansion of the Russian Communist Empire. As I understand it, one of the principal purposes motivating the President in arranging this exchange is to make abundantly clear the firmness of our resolve to support freedom-loving and freedom-seeking peoples everywhere. At the same time the President recognizes that mutual exchange of ideas and the exploration of every area of agreement may narrow down areas of disagreement and possibly lay the groundwork for a genuine peace.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, it should be of deep interest to every Member of this body to know the concern with which small businessmen throughout the country view the state of present laws dealing with labor-management relations under which they must try to exist.

Recently I requested Administrator Wendell B. Barnes of the Small Business Administration to furnish me with his views as to the need for effective reform legislation in this field. In particular, I asked for his comments on the substitute bill which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and I introduced last week.

Mr. Barnes' reply to my inquiry is most enlightening. The text of his letter follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1959.

Hon. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRIFFIN: I have your letter of July 30, 1959, requesting my personal views concerning the identical bills (H.R. 8400 and H.R. 8401) recently introduced by you and Congressman LANDRUM to effect the labor reforms which are so essential to correct the shocking abuses exposed by Senator MCCLELLAN'S Committee.

Some of these abuses, such as those involving the internal affairs of labor unions, are not of direct concern to the Small Business Administration. Our principal interest lies in the following: (1) the so-called jurisdictional gap; (2) the abuses presently attending organizational picketing; and (3) secondary boycotts.

Early this year, identical bills were introduced in the House by you and Congressman HIESTAND, together with other Republican members, calling for the correction of numerous defects in the labor laws. In a letter addressed to Mr. HIESTAND on June 1, 1959, I emphasized the importance to small business of the three problems described above and explained the effects which I thought his bill (H.R. 3545) would have on them. As you will note, I was satisfied with the provisions of H.R. 3545 dealing with blackmail picketing and secondary boycotts but had some reservations concerning the language of that portion of the bill dealing with the jurisdictional gap.

This is a vital matter. In view of the fact that it cannot possibly handle all labor disputes affecting interstate commerce, the NLRB has found it necessary to decline to exercise jurisdiction in cases of lesser importance. To this end, it has established yardsticks based, directly or indirectly, upon the annual dollar volume of interstate sales and purchases transacted by employers.

An aggrieved employer whose volume is below that set for the type of business in which he is engaged cannot normally obtain a hearing from the Board. Nor can he, under the Supreme Court's interpretation of the law, obtain relief from his State courts. Some 3 million small concerns are caught in this incredible situation, utterly defenseless against the wrongs inflicted upon them by labor unions. These businesses are, for all practical purposes, helpless.

It is imperative that an employer whose volume of interstate business is below that established by the Board for the type of enterprise in which he is engaged should have direct and immediate access to the courts of his State for the settlement of any labor dispute. It should not be necessary, as has been suggested, for him to obtain a specific declination from the Board before obtaining such access. Since the Board normally has a crowded docket, the resulting delay would, in most instances, bring financial ruin to the business concern involved in the dispute, even though the Board eventually declines jurisdiction and even though the small-business owner wins his case. Time is of the essence in these matters.

Section 701 of the Griffin-Landrum bill, concerning the jurisdictional gap, appears to have been drafted with this problem in mind. I prefer its provisions to those made for the jurisdictional gap in the earlier measure sponsored by you, Congressman HIESTAND and others. Similarly, section 705 of the bill deals effectively with blackmail picketing and secondary boycotts.

The introduction of the Griffin-Landrum proposal has done much to lessen the dismay felt by all friends of small business at the unbelievably weak bill (H.R. 8342) approved by the House Committee on Education and Labor. The blunt truth is that the latter measure contains nothing whatsoever to remedy, or even to alleviate, the three problems described above. That bill can be supported only by turning one's back on the small businesses of the Nation.

As I told Congressman HIESTAND, there are some 27 million people in the small-business community, owners and unorganized employees, who are the principal victims of the deficiencies in existing law. They are closely watching this legislation. They expect their interests to be protected by Congress, notwithstanding the efforts of some labor leaders to thwart remedial action.

In behalf of small business, I thank you, Mr. LANDRUM, Mr. HIESTAND and the others who are making a splendid effort to establish justice in the field of labor-management relations.

Sincerely yours,

WENDELL B. BARNES,
Administrator.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCHERER, for August 4, 5, and 6, on account of hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities in New York City.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, for 20 minutes, on August 6.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona, for 60 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, for 20 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CORBETT.

Mr. DENT.

(At the request of Mr. GLENN, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

(At the request of Mr. KING of Utah, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. BARR.

Mr. EDMONDSON.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1590. An act for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1849. An act to amend the act of August 10, 1939, authorizing the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 697. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire certain real property in the county of Solano, Calif., to transfer certain real property in the county of Solano, Calif., and for other purposes; and

H.R. 3322. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, and certain other laws to authorize the payment of transportation and travel allowances to escorts of dependents of members of the uniformed services under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 577. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, section 2481, to authorize the United States Coast Guard to sell certain utilities in the immediate vicinity of a Coast Guard activity not available from local sources;

S. 906. An act to amend section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to clarify the meaning of the term "change of program of education or training" as used in such section;

S. 1110. An act to amend the act of August 4, 1955 (Public Law 237, 84th Cong.), to provide for conveyance of certain interests in the lands covered by such act;

S. 1367. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft;

S. 1694. An act to extend the existing authority to provide hospital and medical care for veterans who are United States citizens temporarily residing abroad to include those with peacetime service-incurred disabilities;

S. 2153. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to accept, operate, and maintain a certain defense housing facility at Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes; and

S. 2183. An act granting the consent of Congress to interstate compacts for the development or operation of airport facilities.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 3, 1959, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5674. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6769. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 5, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1269. A letter from the national commander, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting a copy of the minutes of the last convention of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., together with the auditor's report for the fiscal year ending August 31, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 85–530; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1270. A letter from the executive director, U.S. Olympic Association, Inc., transmitting a report covering the financial operations of the U.S. Olympic Committee as well as those of the U.S. Olympic Association for the year 1958, pursuant to the act of Congress known as Public Law 805; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1271. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 29, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on hurricane survey of Stamford, Conn., authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 210); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1272. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a report of a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, involving appropriation 49-11X0066, "Translation of Publication and Scientific Cooperation (Transfer to National Science Foundation)"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1273. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1274. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to remove geographical limitations on activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1275. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to provide flexibility in the performance of certain functions of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and of the Weather Bureau"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1276. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1277. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Constantinos Partheniades, A-6975372, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1278. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Manuel Lopez, A-2753700, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1279. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the cases of Nicholas Partheniades and his wife Cartherine Partheniades, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2210. An act to provide for the disposition of the Philadelphia Army Base, Philadelphia, Pa., without amendment (Rept. No. 758). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STRATTON: Committee on Armed Services. Senate Joint Resolution 24. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand; without amendment (Rept. No. 759). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BREWSTER: Committee on Armed Services. Senate Joint Resolution 106. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium; without amendment (Rept. No. 760). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services, H.R. 65. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Michigan of certain land in Grayling Township, Crawford County, Mich., to be used for National Guard purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 761). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2449. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Twin Cities Arsenal, Minn., to Independent School District No. 16, Minnesota; with amendment (Rept. No. 762). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3923. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to persons who have served as members of a U.S. expedition to Antarctica; without amendment (Rept. No. 763). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2247. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the county of Sacramento, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 764). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6269. A bill to amend section 265 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 to define the term "a member of a Reserve component" so as to include a member of the Army or Air Force without specification of component; without amendment (Rept. No. 765). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8315. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Fort Crowder, Mo., to Stella Reorganized Schools R-I, Missouri; with amendment (Rept. No. 766). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 554. An act for the relief of Argyrios G. Georgandopoulos; with amendment (Rept. No. 746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 593. An act for the relief of Angelinas Cuacos Steinberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 967. An act for the relief of Lea Levi; with amendment (Rept. No. 748). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1665. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vassiliki P. Theodorou; without amendment (Rept. No. 749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1701. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Leschner; with amendment (Rept. No. 750). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2946. A bill for the relief of Cecil E. Finley; without amendment (Rept. No. 751). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3801. A bill for the relief of Harry and Lena Stopnitsky; with amendment (Rept. No. 752). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5530. A bill for the relief of Peter Clemens August Grauert and Hans Herbert Grauert; with amendment (Rept. No. 753). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5645. A bill for the relief of Christopher J. Mulligan; with amendment (Rept. No. 754). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6886. A bill for the relief of Liliana Caprara; without amendment (Rept. No. 755). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6954. A bill for the relief of Frol Martin Simonov; without amendment (Rept. No. 756). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 1695. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Francis E. Resta; with amendment (Rept. No. 757). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H.R. 8508. A bill to authorize the procurement of certain aircraft for training of the Air Force Reserve and for the transportation of ground combat units in time of war or emergency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 8509. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of property acquired from a decedent who died before January 1, 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 8510. A bill to amend the act of August 8, 1958 (72 Stat. 544), providing for the establishment of a Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.R. 8511. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under certain conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 8512. A bill to provide that, during a 4-year period, revenues derived from the tax on parts and accessories and a portion of the tax on automobiles shall be deposited in the highway trust fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 8513. A bill to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 8514. A bill to authorize the sale of 40 acres of land owned by the Creek Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 8515. A bill to incorporate the Sea Cadet Corps of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 8516. A bill to provide for the retirement of Federal Reserve bank stock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8517. A bill to provide that the Department of Defense shall enter into contracts for air transportation with air carriers as defined by the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 8518. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 by adding thereto provisions relating to civil aviation medical research, human requirements in aircraft design and conditions of operations, and the medical causes of accidents in air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 8519. A bill to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, certain portions of shoreline areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H.R. 8520. A bill to establish a joint board and to permit the filing of through routes and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska, Hawaii, and the other States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8521. A bill to establish a joint board and to require mandatory through routes and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska, Hawaii, and the other States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 8522. A bill to amend the act of July 17, 1952; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 8523. A bill to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 8524. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 8525. A bill to provide a health benefits program for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 8526. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, relating to the trust funds of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 8527. A bill to exempt certain pension and other trusts established in the District of Columbia from the laws of the District of Columbia relating to perpetuities, restraints on alienation, and accumulation of income; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Con. Res. 370. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that a sound dollar is the basis for future growth and security of the Nation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 371. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. Con. Res. 372. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that a sound dollar is the basis for future growth and security of the Nation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SILER:

H. Res. 336. Resolution authorizing certain Members of the House of Representatives to use funds available to them under House Resolution 314 of the 86th Congress for the purpose of aiding certain needy school children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 8528. A bill to authorize the President to reappoint Elwood R. Quesada, formerly lieutenant general, U.S. Air Force, retired, to the grade of major general and retire him in the grade of lieutenant general, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 8529. A bill for the relief of Aida Rabaya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 8530. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Raymond P. Finnegan, to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 8531. A bill for the relief of Anna Rosati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 8532. A bill to authorize the President to reappoint Elwood R. Quesada, formerly lieutenant general, U.S. Air Force, retired, to the grade of major general and to retire him in the grade of lieutenant general, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H.R. 8533. A bill for the relief of Celerina Lazalita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Observance of Swiss Independence Day by the Swiss Rifle Club, Altoona, Pa., August 2, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, among the many observances in the United States of the 668th anniversary of Swiss Independence Day none was more colorful and interesting than the program conducted by the Swiss Rifle Club, Altoona, Pa., August 2, 1959.

It was my privilege to deliver the principal address to the several hundred American citizens of Swiss descent who were present for the enjoyable occasion.

My address follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, FOR THE CELEBRATION OF SWISS INDEPENDENCE DAY BY THE SWISS RIFLE CLUB, ALTOONA, PA., AUGUST 2, 1959

For 668 years, August 1 has been a great day for the Swiss.

Today, we celebrate Swiss Independence Day—the anniversary of the founding of the Swiss Everlasting League for Common Defense.

On August 1, 1291, the first milestone was passed in the evolution of the modern federation of Swiss cantons.

Today in the United States, several hundred thousand Americans of Swiss origin rightfully look with pride on the achievements of their forebearers almost 700 years ago.

Throughout the United States, Americans of Swiss descent have formed over 300 organizations.

Thus a widespread celebration of this great holiday throughout the United States is assured.

These organizations—such as the Swiss Rifle Club of Altoona—make invaluable contributions to the civic, cultural, social, and recreational life of their communities.

They are a splendid example of the unique capacity of the Swiss to "live the good life," in harmony with one another and with their neighbors.

On August 1, 1291, the Everlasting League was formed as a measure of self-defense against all who might attack them.

This league was the foundation of the modern Swiss Federation.

From the very beginning, the Swiss Confederates showed a willingness to fight for independence from foreign domination.

In 1313, a valiant band of Swiss Confederates completely defeated a brilliant Austrian army on the precarious slopes of Mortgarten.

Two years later, representatives of the victorious Swiss Highlanders met at Lake Lucerne to reaffirm the everlasting league and to strengthen the unity of the confederation.

The league won great renown for its victory at Mortgarten over the Hapsburg oppressors.

As years passed, other members were admitted to the original alliance of the three cantons.

First came Lucerne.

The ancient town of Zurich followed, after receiving aid from the four confederated cantons against the threat of an attack from Austria.

Glarus and Zug were admitted in 1352, and the next year, the famous town of Berne entered the confederation.

Thus by the end of the 14th century, the threats of invasion and foreign rule and the glories of Mortgarten had impelled eight Swiss communities to join hands in collective self-defense.

While preserving their territorial integrity and independence by joint action for common defense, the Swiss confederation continued to expand.

By 1815 the confederation of Swiss States had grown into an organization of 22 cantons.

1848, when the cantons united into a federal state, was a memorable year in Swiss history.

The Constitution of 1848 added strength to the union by increasing the authority of the central government over national defense, foreign relations, internal security, customs, the postal service, and the promotion of the common welfare.

A national government with a cabinet, a federal supreme court, and a legislature was established.

Each canton retained its own legislature, executive, and judiciary for local affairs.

Thus from the formation of the Everlasting League on August 1, 1291—which we are celebrating today—the Swiss people have developed into one of the world's most stable and successful governments.

America promised broader opportunities than many of the most ambitious, adventurous, and gifted sons and daughters of Switzerland could find in the crowded, narrow valleys of their Alpine homeland.

Consequently, for nearly 350 years, a small but steady stream of immigrants from Switzerland has contributed immeasurably to the development of our own Republic.

As early as the 17th century, Swiss settlers immigrated to Colonial America.

Many of these early Swiss colonists came from communities where they were not permitted to practice their religious convictions.

The Swiss Mennonites were among these victims of religious persecution.

Large numbers of Mennonites made the decision to join in the movement that resulted in the settlement in Lancaster County.

During the 18th century, religious persecution abroad and more promising economic opportunities in the New World motivated about 25,000 Swiss people to begin a new life in the American colonies.

The Swiss settlers were warmly welcomed by the New World.

From the beginning of colonization in North America, Swiss were eagerly sought as settlers because of their mountain-bred hardihood and their rare combination of agricultural and industrial skills.

For example, Swiss craftsmen were imported to provide technical assistance to the colonists in the art of woodworking and silk production, and Swiss families were brought to America because of their expert ability in raising grapes and producing wine.

The Swiss colonists, inspired by their 500-year tradition of liberty and self-government in Switzerland, made an important contribution to the movement for American independence.

Freedom-loving colonists of Swiss origin were among the earliest and strongest supporters of the Revolutionary War.

The Reverend John Zubly of Georgia was a delegate to the Continental Congress.

Judge Emanuel Zimmerman of Pennsylvania and Henry Wisner of New York rallied support for the Revolution by their valuable service on the committees of safety in their respective States.

Wisner was one of the most farsighted leaders of the Revolution.

When the British embargoed the importation of ammunition into the colonies in 1774, Wisner—anticipating the inevitable outbreak of active warfare—boldly established a gunpowder mill in his home in New York State.

Elected to both the First and Second Continental Congresses, Wisner worked unceasingly for the adoption of the Declaration of Independence.

After the outbreak of the Revolution, Wisner built two more ammunition plants, and then, as a colonel in George Washington's army, he helped plan the defense of West Point and the Hudson Highlands.

Throughout the Revolutionary War, the Continental Army was supplied with shot and cannonballs from the iron works of John Jacob Faesch, a Swiss immigrant and a friend of Washington.

A Swiss gunsmith, Martin Meylin, erected the first boring mill in America—near Lancaster, Pa.—and trained other craftsmen in the making of rifles.

Meylin's long-ranged rifles were so effective against the Redcoats that the British Parliament hastily investigated what it called "these strange arms used with such deadly certainty by American regiments."

Many Swiss-Americans laid down their plows and tools of trade, picked up their rifles, and marched off to war in answer to the Continental Congress's call for volunteers in 1776.

Pennsylvania was asked to contribute six companies of sharpshooters, but so many volunteers stepped forward—especially from the frontier counties where hardy Swiss settlers were concentrated—that an entire battalion was formed.

In addition, many Swiss settlers fought in all the German-speaking units from Pennsylvania.

In addition, a Swiss fur trader, Charles Gratiot, sacrificed his personal fortune to provide supplies for the starving forces of George Rogers Clark during the parlous campaigns in the Northwest Territory.

These and other Swiss patriots of the American Revolution—like Emanuel Carpenter and George Zillicoffer—wrote their distinguished records into the glorious pages of U.S. history.

Swiss-Americans have been active in politics, too.

One of the United States greatest political leaders was Albert Gallatin, who left his classes in Geneva to enlist as a volunteer under Lafayette.

After the war, Gallatin became a teacher at Harvard and then moved to the Pennsylvania frontier where he surveyed land, built a gun factory and a glass works, and became a naturalized citizen of the United States.

Soon Gallatin was elected to the Pennsylvania Legislature and then to Congress.

In Washington, he distinguished himself as a dynamic political leader.

For 13 years, he served as Secretary of the Treasury.

During this term, the public debt was cut in half and the internal revenue taxes were abolished.

Later, Gallatin was one of the negotiators of the treaty which terminated the War of 1812.

Afterward he served 8 years as our Minister, first, to Great Britain and, then, to France.

This durable Swiss-American lived to the ripe old age of 88.

After his retirement from active politics at age 66, Gallatin became one of the leading American historical scholars of his time.

Following in Gallatin's footsteps, many other Americans of Swiss origin have achieved fame in public life.

Swiss-Americans have served as Attorney General, Senators, U.S. Representatives, State Governor, Supreme Court Justice, and in many other important capacities.

Former President Herbert Hoover traces his ancestry back to Swiss descendants who emigrated to Pennsylvania in 1738.

Furthermore, a large number of Swiss-Americans have risen to high posts in our Armed Forces, including Adm. Edward Eberle, the World War I Chief of Naval Operations, who exploded the old joke about "Swiss admirals."

Both Gen. Robert Eichelberger, former Army Chief of Staff, and Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, are descended from early Swiss emigrants to Pennsylvania.

The resourceful Swiss farmers have made amazing accomplishments in tilling the soil of America.

In Switzerland, farmers were able to prosper on the sharply sloping and rocky fields only because of their ingenuity in developing new crops, better cattle feed, and improved methods of fertilization.

Therefore, when they came to America, the Swiss brought along with them not only their rugged tenacity and their love for the earth, but also their openminded willingness to experiment.

In South Carolina, for example, Swiss farmers converted the coastal swampland into flourishing and productive fields of rice.

In the Napa Valley of California, Swiss vine dressers made a highly successful experiment in grafting the choicest varieties of European grapes onto native American root stocks and thus succeeded in establishing large vineyards for the production of wines.

For over 100 years, Swiss families, such as the Delmonicos, have propagated the cult of fine cooking all over America.

Americans of Swiss ancestry have played major roles in the development of the chemical, textile, electrical, and automotive industries in the United States.

Many of our leading scientists, engineers, and doctors of medicine were born or educated in one of the several great universities in Switzerland.

Among the first Swiss settlers in Pennsylvania were a few skilled clock and watchmakers.

Many other practitioners of the trade followed these initial craftsmen.

Today, scattered all over America, the descendants of these superb technicians occupy major positions wherever fine watches or other precision instruments are manufactured.

How can one explain the vast current of contributions that have been made to the edification of America by so small a stream of immigration as that which has flowed from Switzerland?

Undoubtedly, individual talents and a high level of education were important.

Of far greater significance is the fact that the Swiss in the United States have come from a country where for many centuries the members of four language groups and several religious faiths have lived together in peace, harmony, and brotherhood.

In America, they encountered no problem of assimilation which they had not already met and overcome in their homeland.

Thus, to become Americans, the Swiss had merely to be themselves.

Swiss National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, August 1 is the anniversary of the founding of the Swiss Confederation and is one of the oldest national holidays in all Europe. The Swiss people, keenly aware of their distinct individuality and possessing a robust character, have maintained their freedom because they proved always ready to defend their liberties against all comers. They have taken up arms innumerable times in defense of their freedom in the course of many centuries.

The Swiss people built their cherished republic in the hard way. Of course there is no easy road to national independence, but the stouthearted people of that mountainous country high up in Europe attained theirs very gradually in slow stages. Beginning with the Defensive League formed on August 1, 1291, their persistent efforts led to practical independence in 1499, and finally culminated in complete independence from the Holy Roman Empire in 1648.

Since those distant days the Swiss people have stoutly maintained their independence and their freedom of action

against all foes. This little country of just over 15,000 square miles, with a population a little over 5 million, has earned the respect and admiration of all countries, great and small, powerful and weak. No conqueror or dictator has dared to violate Swiss neutrality, which the people cherish as their most priceless possession next to their independence. As a matter of fact the Swiss feel, with considerable justification, that their very independence is in a way conditioned on their centuries-old neutrality.

Today Switzerland with its democratic government, its efficient democratic institutions, its highly developed technology, and its sound finance and stable currency, has become a living model for efficient democracy. Through their industry, ingenuity, education, and utilization of their natural gifts, the well-meaning, humane, impartial, and highly public-spirited Swiss people have made a valuable contribution to the whole world. By working together, irrespective of their French, German, and Italian origin, they have proved to the world that for the good of all concerned it is better to subdue linguistic and racial feelings and develop a higher and better type of patriotism. In this spirit they have fought their adversaries, have won their independence, and have proved always ready to fight for its preservation.

On this anniversary of their national holiday, I wish them continued prosperity and a happy and peaceful future.

New Hospital: Community Cooperation at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, Sunday afternoon, July 19, my home town, Jeannette, Pa., celebrated the answer to many years of planning, working, and sacrificing.

It was on this date that the Jeannette District Memorial Hospital was dedicated.

As the speaker for this occasion, I was prepared to join many leaders in religious, medical, political, business, and labor fields in giving credit where due and to impress upon my peoples the need for continued effort if the hospital was to be a success.

A short chronological history of this project shows the will of the people cooperating and achieving at its best.

HISTORY

In 1947, the movement for a hospital in Jeannette was started by Mr. Joseph Cononico, of Jeannette. He assembled a group of interested citizens of Jeannette and the surrounding area to initially start Operation Hospital. During 1948 and 1949, hopes and plans for the new hosiptal were conceived. When the city of Jeannette donated a 6½-acre site in Paruco Park, concrete plans for the hospital were formulated, and a drive for funds began. You demonstrated your desire for a new hospital by pledging $435,000. Based upon the success of this first drive, the structure of the originally planned 70-bed hospital was erected, the main exterior work was completed, staircases were built in, and provisions were made for the installation of elevators.

In 1952, another drive for funds was conducted in order that the existing structure might be completed, and the drive resulted in additional pledges of $60,000. This additional amount was inadequate to complete the structure as a result construction remained almost at a standstill until 1955 due to lack of funds.

In 1955, interest was renewed, and plans were drawn up for the addition of an east wing to the existing structure which would increase bed capacity to at least 100. This addition was considered necessary due to the increased demands for hospital services in our growing area. But before going any further with construction, two great problems had to be solved. First, how could the community procure and retain the administrative staff necessary to maintain the high level of efficiency we desired for our hospital? Secondly, where were the necessary funds going to come from?

The Sisters of Charity came forth with the answer to the first problem, by agreeing to provide the administrative staff for operation. They would assume supervision, and the maintenance of the highest standards of efficiency would be definitely assured.

After provision was made for an administrative operating staff, the solution to the second problem was begun by conducting a third drive for funds in 1955, during which time pledges amounting to $535,000 were obtained. The Greensburg Diocese also volunteered a gift of $300,000 making a combined total of $835,000. The association was aware that these funds were not sufficient to complete the job. Accordingly, through the untiring efforts of several members, they were successful in obtaining Federal funds to supplement the funds from the third drive. After bids were received, the association realized that increased construction costs required greater funds. It was at this point that with the aid of Hill-Burton Federal funds, the Greensburg Diocese volunteered additional financial assistance amounting to $250,000.

These combined efforts have not been in vain, because our hopes and dreams of a new hospital have finally materialized. The total cost of the completed project is over $2 million. Your hospital is a modern and up-to-date facility consisting of 100 beds and 28 bassinets. It is understandable that the demands of industrial and personal requirements in our fast-growing area will call for the many services which our Jeannette Hospital offers.

We can all be proud of our new hospital. Its completion has only been made possible by the cooperation, sacrifice, and many hours of hard work by many devoted Jeannette and area citizens. It is to these citizens we wish to express our heartfelt thanks for a job well done.

Now that we have its doors open in the name of Christian charity, this beautiful and practical structure has already given the community a much needed lift in community pride and feeling of security.

One cannot stress too much the work of the auxiliary made up of generous-hearted, inspired women from the surrounding communities as well as the city itself. It was their example and determination through the dark days of dampened ardor and financial worries that—along with the bulldog tenacious courage of a few men—kept the project alive.

As a citizen of this community I cannot help but feel the pride that comes from living in a community where things can and are done by public-spirited cooperation.

We know our problems are not over and that the Sisters of Charity will need the continued unselfish help of all of us. This hospital is part of our town to be cared for, nurtured, protected, and serviced.

If we do this as a community, the good Sisters of Charity in turn will give us the care and protection our hospital is capable of producing.

Let us then rededicate ourselves to our original purpose "to build and maintain a hospital for the care and betterment of our community and its peoples."

Secretary Benson's Reply to Letter From Howard Hill, of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, I caused to be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the text of a letter which Howard Hill, of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, wrote to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, expressing his views with respect to the current farm program and what could be done to improve it.

This letter appears in the July 28 RECORD. It outlines several areas where the program could be modified to bring about a more realistic approach to the farm problem in the light of today's national economy. It is worthy of attention.

Equally worthy of attention is the reply which Secretary Benson sent to Mr. Hill. Because I feel that the extension of Mr. Hill's letter in the RECORD justifies a similar courtesy to Secretary Benson, I have asked for, and have been granted, permission to publish it as I see fit. Accordingly, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Mr. Benson's reply to Mr. Hill appear in the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
WASHINGTON, *July 24, 1959.*

Mr. E. HOWARD HILL,
President, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation,
Farm Bureau Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

DEAR MR. HILL: May I express my sincere appreciation to you for taking the time to write me regarding the problems of agriculture. The views of a farm leader such as you, who understands the problems of agriculture and its relation to other segments of this Nation are most welcome.

In speeches, in testimony before congressional committees, and in press conferences I have tried in every way possible to point out many of the very same points which you feel should be called to the attention of the public. In some instances the publicity media have misused the implications of the facts we have been trying to present to the American people.

I believe that there are certain fundamental factors which all citizens should recognize:

(1) Farmers have done a magnificent job—outstripping industry in productivity.

(2) The American standard of living would have been at a much lower level in the absence of the high production levels generated by farmer efficiency.

(3) This increase in efficiency has enabled the rest of our society to eat better at lower costs.

(4) The farmers relative position in our society has been definitely injured by the impact of inflation. Both the cost-price squeeze and the increase in marketing margins are real and disturb me greatly. We cannot play fast and loose with the Federal budget without ultimately impairing the position of agriculture. We cannot have soft wage settlements and undue price rises without impairing the position of agriculture. Those who have posed as friends of agriculture while at the same time recommending policies which result in more creeping inflation are the enemies to agriculture. Those who say "a little inflation is inevitable, relax and enjoy it" are doing a tremendous disservice to our farm people.

Your letter makes several suggestions. I have examined these suggestions carefully. In reply, I should like to make the following comments.

The conservation reserve program has proved to be an effective attack on the source of the surplus problem. Under this program substantial amounts of farmland have been shifted out of production for periods of 3 to 10 years or more. This had led in many instances to a permanent shift of such land to uses for which it is better adapted. It achieves this adjustment without subjecting our farm people to further regimentation and without the necessity of the Government having to take ownership of the farmland.

Experience under the conservation reserve program has shown that in many instances the program has resulted in speeding up some trends generally recognized as being desirable. This includes such trends as reforestation over wide areas of deteriorated lands, particularly in the Southeast, and expansion of allied industries. Another example is the nearly 5 million acres of Great Plains land that have been included in the conservation reserve program. Nearly all of that acreage has been planted to grass, to the longtime benefit of the Great Plains area.

Up to this time 23 million cropland acres have been signed up in the conservation reserve. Much, if not most, of this land is of average or better productivity and has been retired at least temporarily from adding to our surplus problems and at lower cost than disposing of surpluses.

We have recommended that the conservation reserve authority should be extended.

But there is no point in pushing disposal programs and the conservation reserve on the one hand unless we tie it all in with realistic price support action on the other.

With respect to the utilization of surplus agricultural commodities, we have taken many steps to increase the effectiveness of utilization of our surpluses. As you know, we are moving forward steadily to implement the President's food for peace program.

In an effort to improve the position of agriculture we have recommended the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, Public Law 480. We feel that this program has been of great assistance in keeping agricultural exports at a high level. We have recommended an extension and will continue to do so as long as it is necessary.

We have held meetings with the principal wheat exporting countries to review operations under existing programs and to explore additional methods whereby agricultural abundance can be used constructively in the free world.

Expansion of exports of U.S. farm products is difficult. Although it may be uneconomic, many countries try to be as self-sufficient as possible in agriculture. To achieve protection they impose substantial import duties and other barriers to increased trade in farm commodities.

We have had some problems with respect to our efforts to increase exports under special Government programs. Most countries, even those lesser developed, take into account their own production while seeking assistance under concessional Government programs. On a total basis, for example, world production of wheat, rice and feed grains in 1958 reached an alltime high. Wheat production in 1958 is estimated at nearly 9 billion bushels, 12 percent above the 1956 record crop and 25 percent above the 5-year average for 1950–54. Obviously there is a relationship between world production of food and feed crops and the quantities of these commodities which we might program under title I and other programs.

Our best opportunities to increase food and fiber consumption and to export food for economic development purposes are in the less-developed countries. These countries, however, often have limited port, transportation, and storage facilities which place a physical restriction on their capacity to import commodities. I have not intended to belabor the problems encountered in maximizing U.S. agricultural exports. But in seeking ways to use our surpluses we must be realistic. We must recognize some of the limitations involved. However, we shall continue to do everything sound and feasible to maximize our exports.

In addition we have in operation a very substantial food donation program, both at home and abroad.

Over the past 7 years we have moved a total of 12 billion pounds of food out of CCC warehouses and onto the plates of schoolchildren and the needy, at home and abroad. In just this past year, over 14 million of our schoolchildren used this food. Almost one and a half million in the Nation's charitable institutions and millions of needy individuals in families have benefited from our donation programs.

We are reaching the areas of greatest need. Of 74 major labor market areas classified as "areas of substantial labor surplus" in March of this year, our donation program was operating in 72. The commodity donation program also reached a large number of distressed rural areas not officially designated as labor surplus areas. In many counties we have, month in and month out, been supplying food to better than 25 percent of the total population resident in those counties. In a few counties of severe economic distress, we have been supplying food to more than 40 percent of the county population.

I want to emphasize that participation in the domestic donation program is entirely at the option of State and local officials.

After requirements of domestic recipients have been met, the Department has exerted every effort to move available surplus foods to the needy abroad. In the past fiscal year, an estimated 60 million people in 85 countries benefited from these surplus foods.

This has been a striking record of achievement, at home and abroad. But, we are asked, why don't you do more? I would like to make the answer crystal clear.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is not a supermarket bulging with a fabulous variety of foods. I have seen articles and speeches citing the fruits and vegetables, the meats and fresh eggs we presumably have on hand. You know and I know that we have none of these items in our inventory.

Better than 85 percent of our inventory consists of the so-called basics, corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. We are processing and distributing corn, wheat, and rice—every pound that any accredited agency anywhere in the United States says it can use for needy people without waste.

We are similarly distributing dry milk. Likewise, we have distributed butter and cheese until it became necessary to reserve remaining supplies for schools and charitable institutions. And, when it became apparent that eggs faced extreme marketing difficulties, we used section 32 funds to process eggs and distribute them in dried form.

We believe we are doing everything feasible in the field of utilization of available surplus foods in the most constructive manner possible to help those in greatest needs.

We agree with you that utilization research to find industrial uses for farm products should be expanded. There have been many recommendations for crash programs which in some cases involve setting up a new agency. This would mean competing for available scientists who it is generally recognized are in relatively short supply.

During the past 6 years the budget for agricultural research has more than doubled. This is concrete evidence of our interest, and that of the Congress, in an adequate, balanced, sound research program. It is rather significant that last year our appropriation was cut below our request for utilization research. You may rest assured that such a program will have our continuing and vigorous attention with emphasis on utilization and market expansion.

With respect to the study requested regarding the European Common Market I have asked the Foreign Agricultural Service to analyze the implications.

With respect to the elimination of labor exemptions from antitrust legislation you of course recognize that this matter has been considered at some length by the Congress. You recognize it is technically outside the immediate area of the Secretary of Agriculture. I shall be glad to pass this question on to the Secretary of Labor.

In my recent testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture, I made the following statements:

"My admiration for the job farmers are doing is exceeded only by my sympathy for their problems. The cost-price squeeze and the spread in marketing margins are two economic factors in agriculture that disturb me greatly, as they do all farmers. We are trying to hold the line on inflation. Through increasing emphasis on marketing research we are constantly striving to reduce the gap between what farmers receive for their goods and what these goods sell for.

"These two fundamental problems, plus the more spectacular dilemma of the vast

surplus in a few crops, are certainly not the fault of our farmers.

"They are not to blame. I make this point because as this dilemma worsens, there is a growing public tendency to point the finger of blame at the farmer. This is unfair. Farmers are not responsible for the high costs of Government involvement in agriculture.

"These excessive costs are directly traceable to war-bred legislation continued too long in peacetime. The farmer's response to mandatory price supports at production-stimulating levels was what any reasonable person might expect. Naturally, not all the outlay of public moneys resulting from this overproduction finds its way back to farmers' pockets, as some mistakenly believe. Costs of storage, interest, and handling alone are now about a billion dollars a year."

This statement regarding the unjust criticism of farmers I am sure coincides with yours. I will do everything within my power to give publicity to these heartfelt sentiments. You are to be commended for your efforts on behalf of clarifying public misunderstanding of farmers.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary.

Opinion Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I am reporting herewith the percentage results of my latest poll of public thinking in the 29th Pennsylvania Congressional District on 12 major national issues. I sincerely hope my colleagues in the Congress find them interesting and informative.

As background, I might point out that I have been taking these polls since first coming to Congress in 1939. They are in the form of a printed questionnaire, requiring simple "yes" or "no" answers, and they are mailed to the voters of my district, regardless of political party. The district is almost evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats.

The returns to this questionnaire were exceptionally good, and the total response virtually constitutes a referendum of the district.

The questions and the percentage replies follow without editorial comment.

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
1. Do you believe that the Federal Government should promptly start a program designed to orderly terminate farm price supports?	94	6
2. Do you think that the Congress should pass an annual appropriation of at least $1,000,000,000 for national debt retirement prior to the passage of any other appropriation bill?	85	15
3. Do you agree that if State and local officials enforced existing laws against criminal activities in labor unions that Federal laws in this field would be unnecessary?	38	62
4. Is it your impression that from a military point of view we are stronger than Russia?	51	49
5. Are you more in favor of building the Kinzua Dam than any other plan you know of for controlling the floodwaters of the upper Allegheny River?	67	33
6. Would you vote to reelect President Eisenhower if it were legally possible for him to run again?	63	37
7. Do you favor Federal funds for urban renewal projects?	30	70
8. Would you vote for Federal financial aid to public schools not limited to building construction?	33	67
9. Granting that so many dollars will be voted for foreign aid, would you favor increasing aid to Latin America and decreasing aid to western and southern Europe?	63	37
10. Do you believe that Government is more to blame for inflation than business and labor?	52	48
11. If current wage negotiations in the steel industry indicate a price increase for steel, would you favor the imposition by law of price and wage ceilings for steel and affected metal products?	59	41
12. This, the 86th Congress, has been labeled a "Can Do Congress" by some and a "Won't Do Congress" by others. Would you agree that it is a "Do Little Congress"?	71	29

Support Grows for White Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 21 the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and I introduced in the House, and Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY and GEORGE AIKEN introduced in the Senate, concurrent resolutions calling for the establishment of a Great White Fleet of mercy ships to carry American surplus foods, medical aid, and supplies to disaster and distress areas throughout the world.

This bright new concept for peace, the idea of an Oklahoma naval officer, Comdr. Frank A. Manson, of Tahlequah, has inspired a tremendous outpouring of commendation, good will, and support from the American people across the length and breadth of the land. As you know, the July 27 issue of Life magazine, with a striking cover picture and its lead story and editorial column, threw its full support behind the Manson plan for a Great White Fleet as a "bold proposal for peace," and had a strong followup story in its August 3 issue.

On the day the concurrent resolutions were initially introduced in both Houses of Congress, all types of news media in America immediately showed great interest in the proposal. Radio and TV networks, news services, and independent newspapers made many inquiries and followed up with stories. Great American newspapers have endorsed the idea editorially. For example, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 23 in an editorial entitled "To Relieve Human Suffering," said in part:

> It would be hard to do more good at smaller cost and we hope that Congress will look with favor on the proposal and that in turn it will be approved by President Eisenhower.

In an editorial entitled "Great White Fleet," the Christian Science Monitor of July 27 said in part:

> As a dramatic, impressive, traveling advertisement of Americans' dominant desire to be helpful, not warlike, the idea has enormous possibilities. It certainly should be seriously explored and considered.

A much smaller newspaper, which I understand publishes twice weekly, the Franklin Times, of Louisburg, N.C., in an editorial on Tuesday, July 28, called Manson's idea the "boldest, most imaginative plan offered for world peace and good will we think since the Marshall plan. We highly endorse Commander Manson's plan and would like to see it put into operation with all possible speed."

The response of the American people to this proposal for a new Great White Fleet has been terrific and overwhelming, if the reaction received in my office by telegram, letters, petitions, postal cards, telephone call, and personal calls, is any indication. More than a thousand written communications, some of them signed by 20 or more persons, have already been received on this subject alone. One letter, received from Geneva, Ill., reads as follows:

> A citywide poll was demanded and taken by the citizens of Geneva, Ill., for the promotion of the Great White Fleet. The results are as follows: Those in favor, 3,485; those against, 73; not voting, 2,345 (estimated).

The proposal of the Great White Fleet, if my mail is any criterion, touched a deep wellspring of American faith, vision, and desire to see evidence of the great American dream become more visible to the world. Of all the communications received, only a dozen were opposed to the plan at last count.

Several persons enclosed checks or cash with their letters as tangible evidence of their deep interest and strong desire to see the Great White Fleet go into action. Many, many more, including individuals, corporations, and associations, pledged financial support at the proper time. Some called for a "dollar crusade." At least one person wrote he would be willing to send $100 a year for this purpose. Another person said he would pledge 5 percent of his monthly income and said:

> With 12 to feed, it's all I can do—wish it was more.

Offers of help are being received from very strong and influential groups. Over the weekend, the initial sponsors of the resolutions in the House and in the Senate received a wire from George Killion, chairman of the Committee of American Steamship Lines, composed of major American flag steamship companies operating under contract with the Maritime Administration, offering to meet with sponsors of the project to discuss "ways and means of lending our shipping know-how to the advancement and operation of this inspired project. Our efforts would be directed to establishing experienced shipping organization on a nonprofit basis." We expect to meet with a committee soon to discuss this fine offer.

The Radio and Television Executive Society has strongly endorsed the Great White Fleet proposal. The American Board of Abdominal Surgery called the White Fleet "certainly a positive step," and offered to assist in any manner you desire to obtain the best qualified abdominal surgeons for the White Fleet, and also to provide space in the Journal of Abdominal Surgery to tell the story of the White Fleet.

The American Merchant Marine Library Association has offered its service in providing seagoing library units for the vessels of the Great White Fleet. Publishers, advertising agencies, civic organizations, and many other leaders in business and professional fields have endorsed the plan and offered help and support.

Offers to volunteer their own personal services in the Great White Fleet have been received from many persons in many professions. In addition to doctors and registered nurses, we have had letters offering personal volunteer services from dentists, medical photographers, chaplains, optometrists, licensed practical nurses, hospital dietitians, helicopter pilots, medical secretaries, teachers, physical therapists, and one licensed embalmer. Of great significance to me is the fact that many young people, in high school and in college, have written in connection with their desire to serve with the Great White Fleet, and they indicate they could let this plan be a significant part of their own planning for future education and training, and their own life's work.

Perhaps the strongest support has come from churches and church people across the Nation. Letters of strong support have come from Protestants and Catholics alike, and from people of the Jewish faith. One Buddhist group from a nearby State strongly endorses the proposal.

Because it is typical of the mail along this line which is being received, I should like to quote from a letter received from the pastor of a Congregational church in Iowa:

I am a parish pastor who wishes to commend you and thank you for supporting the idea of the New White Fleet. So long as the project continues to be a nonpartisan, unselfish effort to help peoples of the world who are in need for any reason, I shall be able to speak and work for it. Let us not turn this into a political method but rather let the strength of America speak for itself in surplus given freely, medical and teaching abilities given kindly, and service to mankind as the single aim. A nation as blessed as we are can find a new value in life when it gives to others what it has so much of itself.

He goes on to say he has asked his parish to study the proposal—something many other ministers, Sunday school teachers, and church leaders have done.

The American people who have written to me from practically every State in the Union always provide provocative ideas and are a never-failing source of original thought and great inspiration. In addition to the overwhelming sentiment in favor of the Great White Fleet, there is a strong overtone of the very profound and very urgent desire of the American people to promote the cause of peace and to be helpful to victims of suffering and disaster throughout the world.

A number of letters are concerned that the project might be considered a propaganda scheme and urge that careful precautions be taken to prevent such an eventuality. For example, one man from Illinois wrote me in part:

One reservation: The suggestion that a seventh ship might be added to exhibit U.S. culture and industry might be fraught with danger. It could give rise to the suspicion that the real reason behind the fleet is not true altruism but a desire to create good will for American industry. This would be disastrous to the fleet idea. One suggestion: If a seventh ship were to be added why not make it international in scope and have exhibits of some of the best cultural and most helpful scientific advances from all over the world? I have in mind exhibits of drugs to heal diseases, works of UNESCO, peacetime uses of nuclear energy, etc. This could do much to bind mankind together.

Other letters have suggested that the United Nations, the World Health Organization, or the Red Cross should be brought into the picture. Still others would like to see the ships of the White Fleet named for great names in medicine, for the great nurses of history, or for great scientists.

Many who write stress the urgency for immediate creation of the Great White Fleet and point out that now that it has been publicized "there would be unfavorable repercussions if it is allowed to lapse." Another concern in this connection is the fear that there is "nothing to prevent Russia from taking the idea and beating us to the field." One Tennesseean wrote in part:

With all due respect, please hurry before this turns out to be another Aswan Dam and the Little Ruskie, Mr. K., get in on the act by beating us to it.

Excerpts from some of the many other letters received provide some examples of true Americana. One such letter starts with the sentence:

My husband and I just read the Life magazine article on the Great White Fleet.

And the next concluding sentence reads:

Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead.

Another letter says:

The newly proposed Great White Fleet could be any color as far as I'm concerned. If this plan doesn't materialize, you'll not only disillusion the American people, but also those people who have long been waiting for just such a Great White Fleet.

The text of another letter follows:

I see no point in making my views known in terms of deathless prose. Here's my vote for the Great White Fleet—enthusiastically.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I should like to convey a message to one of our esteemed colleagues by inserting in the RECORD the text of a letter received from Point Lookout, Mo., which reads:

I am not one of your constituents but would sure like to say that I am one of the many down here in these Ozark Hills who would back your bill or resolution favoring the New White Fleet completely. You might pass this letter on to our good friend CHARLIE BROWN and tell him we would like to see him back it, too.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that Mr. BROWN introduced his House Concurrent Resolution 320 calling for the creation of the Great White Fleet on July 21, the very day the initial resolutions were introduced.

Before going on to a discussion of the response from my own Second District of Oklahoma, I should like to read a few excerpts from a self-styled teenager, also from Missouri, who said she had just finished reading about the Great White Fleet. She wrote:

I am only 14 years old, but I am as concerned in our Nation's peace as anyone. The world needs more Commander Mansons. The only thing fighting accomplishes is killing people, while a fleet of mercy ships would create a "good" feeling between those nations that are not as fortunate as the United States. This is just my point of view, but maybe other people have the same idea. This is a teenager's opinion.

Mr. Speaker, the mail I have received from the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma has been overwhelmingly in support of this proposal. Only one letter has been received at last count from my district in opposition; and, of approximately 65 letters received from Oklahomans outside my congressional district, only one was opposed. The letters of support are similar to those received from all over the country, and include offers of financial support, the volunteering of professional services by physicians, television personnel, dentists, and teachers, and general strong endorsement of the Manson plan.

I am proud to say that the first written message I received on the Great White Fleet proposal came from my district. On July 21, the officers and members of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 4877, in Muskogee, Okla., wired me through their commander, Clyde Neff, as follows:

The proposed resolution of sending mercy ships to the world's disaster areas is of a vital concern to the VFW Post 4977. This

proposal would help promote peace and good will throughout the world. As one nation and one people under God, we should aid our fellow man in time of need. Therefore, we fully endorse and support this proposal and trust that every effort will be put forth for its passage into law.

John Mahoney, of Radio Station KVIN, in Vinita, Okla., sent me "a short comment on the Great White Fleet proposal of fellow Oklahoman, Commander Frank Manson," and called it the "best constructive thinking, to encourage good will and further better American interest abroad since 'Willie and Joe'."

My old and cherished friend, Dr. J. R. Graves, of Westville, Okla., wrote me that he endorsed the Manson plan 100 percent, and added:

Now Ed, you may think I am displaying a false impression, but I believe I could get 500 signatures of endorsement and not cross the Barren Fork or the Illinois.

These are two Oklahoma rivers whose confluence is near Adair County where Dr. Graves resides.

Other persons writing letters of strong endorsement from my district include James Dunn, State service officer of the State Veterans Department in Muskogee; Dr. James H. Elliott, of Nowata; Mr. Robert E. Sattler, of Bartlesville, 1st Lt. Donald R. Adair, of Pryor; Mr. Jim Nevens, of Beggs; Mr. and Mrs. Ben Terry, of Henryetta; Mr. and Mrs. Virgil Fields, of Jay; Mr. G. N. Irish, of Muskogee; Mr. Marcel Lefebvre, of Okmulgee; Mr. W. H. Wilson, of Porter; Mr. Joe Kearney, of Henryetta; Mr. Charles L. Harris, of Muskogee; and Mr. Gentry Lee, of Bartlesville.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the American people from whom I have heard in connection with the Great White Fleet proposal overwhelmingly endorse it, just as do the people from my congressional district and from my State. It is my understanding that there are 45 House concurrent resolutions already introduced calling for the establishment of this Great White Fleet, and that 34 Senators are now cosponsors of the Senate concurrent resolution in the other chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the earliest possible action by the Congress on these resolutions, and suggest that the President, with the authority already at his disposal, get things under way immediately so that the Russians do not, as so many Americans have pointed out they could, beat us by bringing this magnificent concept into actuality.

Mr. Speaker, as a final note and as an indication of the potential meaning to the world of this proposal, let me insert in the RECORD this one letter I have received from across our border to the north:

MONTREAL, QUEBEC, CANADA,
Tuesday, July 28, 1959.

DEAR MR. EDMONDSON: Being a young Canadian teacher I can offer you neither time nor money for the wonderful new white fleet which you are sponsoring.

The courage, ingenuity, and kindness of yourself and your fellow Americans will make this dream a reality. We are proud that the United States is our neighbor country.

In the coming season I shall explain your endeavor to my large class, and each child will offer prayers for its success.

May God bless you.

Sincerely,

ROSEMARY SAMSON.

Dedication of Maj. Frank M. Parker Army Reserve Training Center, Chambersburg, Pa., August 1, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the ceremonies in connection with the dedication of the Maj. Frank M. Parker Army Reserve Training Center, Chambersburg, Pa., Saturday, August 1, 1959, and to deliver the principal address.

The dedication ceremonies were attended by hundreds of citizens from Chambersburg and vicinity as well as the military Reserve units who will use the new center for training purposes. The program was interesting and revealed the great admiration and respect that the community had for Maj. Frank M. Parker who lost his life in Korea, as well as the "citizen soldiers" who comprise the Army Reserve units in Chambersburg.

My address follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE FRANK M. PARKER ARMY RESERVE TRAINING CENTER, CHAMBERSBURG, PA., AUGUST 1, 1959

It is a pleasure to be here in Chambersburg, with my wife and son, taking part in a ceremony of such great significance, both local and national, as the dedication of a new Army Reserve Training Center.

I appreciate the invitation and I share wholeheartedly in your satisfaction that the Army has honored Chambersburg, both by selecting the city for this center, and by naming it for Maj. Frank M. Parker, Jr., whose life and death reflect such glory upon his native city.

The sturdy and dignified memorial, serving so practical a patriotic purpose, and a purpose so suited to the character and career of Major Parker, must be gratifying to all who knew and loved him, and most of all to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. James M. Parker, to his wife, Phyllis, to his son, Frank M. Parker III, and to his daughter, Phyllis Kim Parker.

It is good to think that the children of Major Parker, who gave his talents and his energy, his enthusiasm and talent for leadership, to the service of his country, will live here in his city, with—ever before their eyes—this substantial evidence of the honor in which their father's name is held by his grateful country.

On this occasion, I should like to salute the Reserve organizations that are presently assigned to this Reserve training center; namely:

1. The 439th Engineer Company (float bridge), Company A, Third Battle Group, 12th Infantry, 79th Division;

2. Company C, 279th Transportation Battalion (armored carrier) 79th Division;

3. The 920th Ordnance Detachment (technical intelligence);

4. Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2375th Engineer Group (combat) (reinforcement training).

As some of you have undoubtedly heard me say before, I look upon the work of the military Reserves as an essential patriotic duty, a sacrifice of time and effort which good citizens gladly undertake in order to do their part toward keeping their country alert and strong.

The Frank M. Parker Army Reserve Training Center is one of thousands of similar installations throughout the country authorized by the Congress of the United States to provide our Reserve forces with the necessary training facilities.

This Reserve training center will enable the local Army Reserve to continue to maintain their proficiency in the complicated art of modern warfare in this day and age.

Speaking of our Reserve forces as a whole they have not always been in the favorable position of having available adequate training facilities that the Chambersburg units will now enjoy.

Frankly, prior to World War II and also for a period of 4 or 5 years after World War II, our Reserve forces were sadly neglected, however, at that time the Congress recognizing the deplorable state of our Reserve forces enacted into law the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950.

Under the provisions of this so-called basic law—which is the keystone upon which our Reserve facilities programs operate—Congress indicated it would underwrite the construction of permanent training facilities throughout the country so as to insure the maintenance of an adequate Reserve program.

Under the provisions of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 armories are constructed which are 100 percent federally owned and authority is also given to contribute to the individual States for the construction of new National Guard training facilities.

In the latter case, the Federal Government contributes 75 percent of the money required for the development of the Reserve training facilities in conformance with Federal requirements.

For a moment I would like to review the actual status of the Army Reserve training program which includes at the present time nearly 2,000 Reserve training centers scattered throughout the Nation and our Territorial possessions yet only 458 of these training centers are considered by Army commanders to be adequate for continued long-range use.

As a result in the case of the Army Reserve the Department of Defense with the permission of Congress has initiated a vigorous and accelerated program of construction designed to replace existing inadequate facilities.

Thus, during 1958 there were 112 new centers under construction and 80 additional centers were programed for fiscal year 1959 and 1960 thereby resulting in a total of more than 465 newly constructed facilities for the Army Reserve by the end of fiscal year 1961.

In referring to the Army Reserve program I am not unmindful of the Reserve components of the other branches of our Armed Forces who are likewise benefiting from the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950.

These Reserves of the Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and our National Guard play indispensable roles along with the Army Reserve in defense of this Nation in time of war.

The readiness of our Nation's military Reserves is a vital part of our national security and is best indicated by the recent assignment to the National Guard of concurrent

responsibility with Regular Army forces for the manning of Nike batteries located throughout the United States.

This sharing of military responsibility is indicative of not only the state of readiness of various Reserve components but likewise reveals the new mission of the Reserves in modern warfare.

The overall program which involves the National Guard Reserve calls for the deployment of 33 Nike battalions at 116 sites by June 30, 1962.

All 24 of the Nike batteries scheduled to go "on-site" this summer have key personnel currently training at the Army Air Defense Center at Fort Bliss, Tex. The remaining members are actually training at Nike sites under the supervision of the Active Army.

Final transfer of the responsibility of manning the Nike sites from the Regular Army to National Guard units will take place following 2 weeks of field training this summer of the National Guard personnel concerned.

My purpose in referring to the National Guard and its new role in manning Nike battery sites is to emphasize by example the constantly changing requirements of a military reserve in this missile age.

Continuing to use the National Guard Reserve as an example it may be of interest to state that these National Guard missile sites are operated in much of the same way as a volunteer fire department.

In other words, a nucleus of full-time technicians man the equipment around the clock, keeping it in constant readiness and capable of initiating effective fire on the enemy without additional help.

The remaining members of the Nike missile unit are citizen soldiers in their communities and keep up on their military skills by attending weekly drills with their units.

In the event of an emergency these members report immediately to their unit and augment the full-time technicians already manning the equipment thus providing adequate personnel to man and operate the missile unit.

This readiness of our Nation's military Reserves as exemplified by the National Guard Nike missile battery personnel is indicative of the degree of readiness that is to be found in the Reserves of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

In addition the changes in the mission of the National Guard reflect similar changes in military tactics and tables of organization applicable to all Reserve components.

What I am trying to say is simply this; Historically we have had both time and space advantages after the initiation of hostilities in which to expand our forces and provide for their support.

The advent of nuclear weapons in combination with swift means of delivery has denied us these time and space advantages in the event of a general nuclear war.

These changes in military tactics and tables of organization are not only affecting the mission of the Reserves but our military forces in general.

While some may disagree with my views I can see future wars being fought from continent to continent with guided missiles carrying nuclear warheads.

This means that the type of our present-day military machine will be obsolete in a few years unless we keep abreast from day to day with the development of nuclear weapons and the resulting revolution taking place from day to day in the technique of prosecuting war.

As we pass through this transitional period, Congress will be called upon to make momentous decisions affecting military manpower and equipment together with the roles and missions of our Armed Forces.

It has been said many times that without a strong economy the military might of our Armed Forces is imperiled.

Therefore, as we face decisions in the field of national defense, we must protect our economy by getting the most for our Armed Forces out of every dollar spent for national security.

As a member of the House Committee on the Armed Services, which has legislative jurisdiction over the reserves of our country, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the officers and men of Chambersburg's Army Reserve units and at the same time congratulate and thank the citizens of this area for the support they have always given our civilian soldiers, sailors, and airmen who, in the final analysis, are the bulwark of our Nation's defense.

In conclusion it is fitting that on the occasion of the dedication of this Army Reserve training center that we recognize it now and for posterity as a monument to the career and qualities of Maj. Frank M. Parker, a military Reserve who gained undying fame in rendering service to his country as a citizen and a soldier.

Maj. Frank M. Parker will long be remembered, with grateful affection and admiration, by the people of Korea whom he aided and defended, and by the people of America, to whom he stands as an example of stalwart patriotism, untiring energy, and industry, and friendly good neighborliness.

His memory is fittingly symbolized by the Bronze Star of valor; his outstanding service in Korea; symbolized by the sturdy bridge erected in his honor over the Imjin River; and by the loved and honored family that he has left behind him here in the Chambersburg area.

Major Parker will be remembered, too, from this day forward, as his spirit is enshrined in this building and in the organizations identified with it.

May his example be honored and followed by all who are privileged to know and to use the Frank M. Parker Army Reserve Center.

The Federal Credit Union Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, when I came to this Congress about 6 months ago, I was assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee. Since last January our committee has been hard at work on many different bills that have dealt with the financial institutions of this country. It has been a real privilege for me to work on this legislation in committee and to defend it on the floor of the House. Our record so far has been excellent. We have passed bills concerning the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Inter-American Bank, the Federal Reserve System and technical bills designed to modernize the banking laws of the United States.

There has been one big trouble with all this hard work. I am sure that it has been constructive legislation and of real value to this Nation. But all these bills have been so technical and so complicated that it has been very difficult for me to explain to the people of my congressional district just what I have been doing.

Last Friday we finally came to a bill which I defended on the floor of the House that everyone can understand. This was the credit union bill. In Marion County, Ind., there are 93 credit unions with a membership of over 60,000 people. These people have joined together in different industrial plants, offices, and agencies of government in a cooperative effort to meet their short term needs for money. While there are not too many people that I can talk to about the highly technical provisions of the Federal Reserve System, there are thousands and thousands of people who understand perfectly well just how a credit union works and what it means to them. It is for this reason that I was so pleased to be able to do my part on the committee and before the House of Representatives in defending this bill.

Basically this credit union bill is an attempt to modernize the law—to bring it up to date. This is just the same thing that we have been doing with the great financial institutions that make up the membership of the Federal Reserve System. Many of us feel that the United States is facing a drastic shortage of money and credit in the next 10 years. Our population is increasing at an explosive rate. In the next 10 years it is very probable that we will have 50 million more people in this country. It is going to take a lot of money and a lot of credit to make sure that these people have jobs, to see to it that they have houses, and that they have the opportunity to live a decent life. It is absolutely necessary that this Nation use its savings as wisely and efficiently as possible. This is the theory that we used in all our previous banking legislation, and this is the theory that we are using in the credit union bill.

Basically this is what the credit union bill does:

First of all, it permits a credit union to make a loan for 5 years instead of the 3-year limit that is now in force. Second, it permits a credit union to loan as much as $1,000 instead of the present $400 limit. Third, it makes it a Federal crime for anybody to rob a Federal credit union. The rest of the bill deals with technical parts of the law, but these three provisions are the things that will be of most interest to credit union members.

The short explanation above shows that in the credit union bill we are trying to bring existing law up to date. We are trying to use the savings of the members of these credit unions wisely and productively. I am certain that this is a good bill, and I think it is especially fitting that this legislation should come on the 50th anniversary of the credit union movement of the United States and the 25th anniversary of the Federal credit union legislation. My work toward the passage of this bill is my personal anniversary gift to the 60,000 members of credit unions back in Marion County, Ind.